

NICHOLAS RIDLEY, D.D.

BISHOP OF LONDON

THE LIFE OF ARCHBISHOP CRANMER.

BY

CHARLES WEBB LE BAS, M.A.
PROFESSOR IN THE EAST INDIA COLLEGE, HERTS, AND LATE
FELLOW OF TRINITY COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE.

VOL. II.

LONDON:
PRINTED FOR J. G. & F. RIVINGTON,
ST PAUL'S CHURCH YARD,
AND WATERLOO PLACE, PALL MALL.

1833.

LONDON:
GILBERT AND RIVINGTON, PRINTERS,
ST. JOHN'S SQUARE.

PREFACE.

Since the publication of the first volume of this work, a complete collection of the "Remains of Archbishop Cranmer," has issued from the Clarendon Press at Oxford, in four octavo volumes, under the editorial superintendence of the Reverend Henry Jenkyns, Fellow of Oriel College. The work is enriched by a most interesting Preface, and by many valuable notes, which abundantly attest the qualifications of the Editor for the office he has undertaken. I gladly take this opportunity of acknowledging my obligations to his labours. They have enabled me to render my own attempt somewhat less unworthy of the public attention, than it otherwise might have been.

The additions and corrections, which Mr. Jenkyns's

edition has suggested, to the former volume of my work, will be found in No. I. of the Appendix to the present volume.

EAST INDIA COLLEGE,
June 1, 1833.

ERRATA IN VOL. I.

For "immemoriably," p. 104, l. 1, read "immemorially."
For "Newbray," p. 156, l. 24, read "Newbury."
For "servility of infatuation," p. 217, l. 12, read "infatuation of servility."
In p. 268, l. 18, expunge "*or*," from the words in the parenthesis.

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER XII.

1549—1551.

CHAPTER XIII.

1550—1552.

CHAPTER XIV.

1551—1553.

CHAPTER XV.

1553—1554.

CHAPTER XVI.

1555—1556.

CHAPTER XVII.

CHAPTER XVIII.

THE

LIFE

OF

ARCHBISHOP CRANMER.

CHAPTER XII.

1549—1551.

Cranmer's supposed Treatise on Unwritten *Verities—Translation of Bertram's Book on the Sacrament—And of "Herman's Consultation"—Attainder of Seymour—The warrant for his Execution signed by Cranmer—His conduct on the occasion considered—His fidelity to the Protector—Letter from Cranmer, Sir W. Paget, and Sir T. Smith, to the Council, on behalf of the Protector—Hopes of the Romanists repressed by the vigilance of Cranmer—He obtains an order for abolition of Popish Books of Devotion—New Formulary of Ordination—First appearance of Non-conformity, in opposition to the Sacerdotal habits—Learned Foreigners entertained by Cranmer—Martin Bucer appointed to the Theological Chair at Cambridge, and Peter Martyr, at Oxford—Disputations at Oxford and Cambridge on the Eucharist—Reflections on that question—Progress of spoliation—Martin Bucer's protest against the plunder of the Church—Bishop Hoper's refusal of the Episcopal habits—Cranmer's firmness in opposition to the scruples of Hoper—Hoper's Compromise—Communion Tables substituted for Altars—Proceedings against Gardiner—Gloomy prospects of the Reformers.*

Cranmer's supposed treatise on *Unwritten Verities.*

In the advancement of the great work of Reformation, now in progress, it will easily be supposed, that the way had been prepared for the march of authority, by

the writings of learned men: and it is well known that, all along, the Archbishop was, sometimes, toiling among the pioneers, while, at others, he was animating, by his counsels, the leaders and standard-bearers of the host. Among the works which have been ascribed to him, is a small treatise on "Unwritten Verities." It is true that this tract has been attributed to the Archbishop without sufficient evidence. But it is also true, that the subject had not escaped his attention. He most assuredly had made collections relative to the question; and, moreover, there is still extant a somewhat copious treatise upon it, which is usually classed among his writings[1]; and which, if justly attributed to him, is one additional monument of the vigilance with which the whole debateable region of theology was surveyed by him, and of his anxiety to provide arms against the assault of the most wily and practised adversaries. This larger work, however, is much too extended to admit of an abstract here. Although, therefore, the shorter treatise, just alluded to, may have been erroneously ascribed to him, the great importance of the subject, together with the probability that the tract was in circulation about this time, may perhaps be allowed to justify some notice of it in this place.

It is, then, notoriously, a vital principle of Romanism, that the revealed will of God has been delivered to mankind, partly in writing, and partly by immemorial tradition; and that these two sources of knowledge are of entirely *co-ordinate* authority. On the

[1] See the concluding chapter of this volume.

other hand, it is one main article in the charter of Protestantism, that the whole of God's own word is contained in Scripture, and that the authority of tradition is purely *subordinate* and auxiliary;—that the Fathers may serve us as guides, to the safe interpretation of Scripture,—and, that, (more especially when their testimony is unanimous,) they may be reverently listened to, where Scripture has spoken doubtfully or sparingly: but, that the Fathers can never speak with the same authority as Scripture, any more than the Scribes could speak with the same authority as the Son of man. It was, obviously, most desirable that the public should be made familiar with correct notions on this subject: and with this view, no doubt, 1550. it was, that the treatise in question was composed. In this little work, it is observed, that, subsequently to what may be called the *golden time* of Christianity, the Clergy began to monopolize the title which rightfully belongs to the whole Christian community,—to call themselves *the Church*, and to claim infallibility; that, under this assumed authority, they gave out that Christ and his Apostles had taught many things that were not to be found in the New Testament, but which had been preserved by *the Church* with unerring fidelity; and that, to these, they gave the name of *Unwritten Verities*. Certain examples are then produced, of the things thus orally handed down to us: as, that Christ, when he had washed the feet of his disciples, instructed them in the preparation of holy cream—that images

were set up by apostolic sanction—that all the world was to acknowledge the supremacy of the Church of Rome—that our Lady was not born in original sin,—and that she was *assumed* into heaven body and soul. In the next place is considered the maxim that traditions are to be believed, *on the authority of the Church*, and that Scripture itself could never stand on higher ground than this: and this maxim is disposed of, by observing, that the authority of Scripture is established by its immemorial and universal reception by the Church, *properly so called*—whereas, the traditions can appeal to nothing higher than the confident averments of certain portions of the Clergy, whose testimony was not worthy to be compared with the general and original consent of all Christian men. It is concluded that if traditions are to be received at all, it should be simply in the spirit of modest acquiescence, not of implicit faith; and that no one thing could be named which more urgently demanded the jealous vigilance of Kings and Princes, than the attempt to invest such *Unwritten Verities* with the same dignity as the *written* word of God. These views are further illustrated by some remarks, adverting to the enormous multitude of ecclesiastical usages; all of which, if the Romish principle be admitted, must, without exception, be invested with the full authority of apostolic traditions: and the inference is, that, we must wander in vain through this vast wilderness in search of the Christian verity, and be compelled to believe more than can ever come to our knowledge.

The theological reader will easily perceive that brief remarks, like these, are scarcely sufficient to conduct us throughout that labyrinth of controversy, which relates to this difficult subject. But it is evident that certain broad principles are here propounded, the knowledge of which would be extremely valuable to all persons who, in that age, were in search of the path, which, if followed out, would eventually lead them to the truth[1].

Translation of Bertram on the Sacrament.

It may be proper to mention in this place, another small tract, which appeared in the year 1549, and which has usually been ascribed to Ridley, but may, with greater probability, be attributed to the Archbishop. For, when Ridley was in the Tower, in 1554, he spoke of it merely as a work which he had *read*,—whereas, if it had actually been his own performance, it is scarcely credible that he would have hesitated to avow it. The volume in question is no other than a translation of the treatise of Bertram, the celebrated monk of Corby, on the Sacramental question; which appeared no less than 700 years before the English Reformation; and which, nevertheless, was found to be a magazine of *Protestant* arguments against the Romish doctrine of the corporeal presence. So expressly were its reasoning and its authorities adapted to the sacramental controversy of the times, that the Roman Catholics affected to believe it a recent forgery! That Cranmer was the translator of this remarkable

[1] Strype's Eccl. Mem. vol. ii. c. 17.—Cranmer's Remains, vol. iv. Appendix, p. 358.

treatise, has not been ascertained; but, in the absence of any positive knowledge on the subject, it would be scarcely possible to name an individual more likely to undertake, or, at least, to encourage and superintend the work. And whether he was concerned in it or not, its appearance may justly be recorded almost as an incident in his life; since it could scarcely have failed essentially to promote the cause, to which all his own faculties were now incessantly dedicated, and to which his life was, eventually, sacrificed.

It is certain that other translations, eminently serviceable to the Protestant cause, which had appeared within the last year or two, had been prepared under the Archbishop's encouragement and patronage. Of these, perhaps the most important, was a volume entitled "the Simple and Religious Consultation of Herman, Archbishop of Cologne and Prince Elector, on the best means of Christian Reformation." The work had been compiled, under the direction of the Elector himself, most probably by Bucer and Melancthon, about the year 1543. The first edition of the English translation appeared in 1547, and was followed by another edition in the course of the next year. It consists of fifty-seven chapters or discourses [1], and was doubtless introduced by Cranmer to the notice

Translation of "Herman's Consultation."

[1] The heads of these discourses are printed by Strype, Eccl. Mem. vol. ii. c. 5.—The book is now very scarce. There is a very fine copy of the Original Latin, in the Library of Trin. Coll. Camb. H. 16. 16, printed at Bonne, 1545.

of his countrymen, as an admirable guide to the true principles of religious restoration. It is one strong testimony to its excellence, that the Elector himself, its venerable patron and promoter, was excommunicated by the Pope; in consequence of which he retired from his Archbishopric, and passed the remainder of his days in privacy and peace.

Before we proceed with our narrative of events more immediately connected with the Reformation, it will be proper briefly to advert to one or two facts, which occurred in the course of the year 1549, and which cannot be left wholly unnoticed in a life of Cranmer.

Attainder of Seymour, in 1549.

The former of these is the attainder of Seymour, the brother of the Protector, and Lord High Admiral of England. The fate of that profligate and turbulent nobleman, and the occurrences which led to it, are matters of general history. The only part of the proceedings against him, in which the Primate is implicated, is the warrant for his execution. Among the members of the Council who set their hands to this instrument, were Somerset and Cranmer. For this act, it is well known, Somerset has been stigmatized as a fratricide; and the Archbishop has not escaped the imputation of unbecoming interference in a cause of blood. It does not fall within our province to examine the merits of the charge against the Protector. With regard to Cranmer, the censure incurred by him, on this occasion,

The warrant for his Execution signed by Cranmer.

His conduct on this occasion considered

was, undoubtedly, rendered plausible enough by the whole tenour of the existing canons; which discountenanced the interposition of Ecclesiastics, in all matters that affected life [1]. It would be needless to inquire, whether these laws were dictated by a sense of the propriety of separating spiritual men from all participation in deeds of extreme, though necessary, severity; or whether they were the produce of that policy, which sought to invest the ministers of religion with a sanctity too exalted for association with merely secular judicatures. But it cannot be denied, that if the Primate had felt himself bound to an observance either of the letter or the spirit of those laws, he must have abstained from giving the sanction of his name to the instrument in question. The fair presumption is, that he conceived himself to be absolved from the necessity of obedience to rules, which rested solely on Romish authority; and that he considered himself at liberty simply to follow the dictates of his own judgment and conscience.

It must, further, be recollected, that Archbishop Cranmer was, at this time, a very conspicuous member of the Council. He must, therefore, have been extremely unwilling to weaken the Government, by seeming to decline his share of responsibility, in a proceeding so momentous as the execution of the Protector's brother. Whether or not the sacrifice were just or necessary, is a totally distinct question. But, if Cranmer was really satisfied that

[1] Burnet, vol. ii. p. 100, 101.

Seymour deserved his fate, the omission of his name on the warrant might have the appearance of treachery to his colleagues.

It is possible, that these considerations may scarcely be sufficient to reconcile a modern reader of history, to the spectacle of a Christian Bishop joining to give the word for the fall of the axe on the neck of a civil delinquent. At the same time, it will readily be conceded, that nothing could be more unreasonable, than to try him, or any of his contemporaries, by principles, which the spirit of better times has since rendered sacred and inviolable, and which now suggest, and virtually command, the absence of Prelates from the House of Lords, whenever the life of man is in jeopardy before them.

Fidelity of Cranmer to the Protector.

It is much more pleasing to contemplate the fidelity with which Cranmer adhered to Somerset himself, when the day of peril and adversity came upon him. It was in the course of the same year, 1549, that he was deposed from the Protectorate. His downfal was hastened by the malice of the Romanists, and the jealousy of the nobles. The Romanists were unable to endure the regency of a Protestant. The opulent and the great were impatient of the influence acquired by an ostentatious devotion to the interests of the people. Even the friends of the Reformation must have perceived, that his services to their cause were estimated, by himself, at a price inordinately costly. His cupidity was gorged with the plunder of the Church. The palaces of Bishops were swept away

from the banks of the Thames, to furnish a site for his princely dwelling. Consecrated edifices were demolished, to provide him with materials for his splendid architecture. Neither the oratories of the living, nor the asylums of the dead, were spared; and Somerset House arose, " in infamous magnificence," out of the spoil. In a word, no man in the kingdom was more thoroughly steeped than *the good Duke*, in the guilt and shame of sacrilege. Nevertheless, when his greatness was departing from him, the Archbishop seems to have remembered nothing but the friendly offices rendered by him to the Reformation. In the general defection of his fellow counsellors, the only three that stood by him, were Cranmer, Sir W. Paget, and Sir Thomas Smith. When he retired to Windsor, he was followed thither by these faithful men; and from that place they addressed a letter to the Council, in the hope that they might be able to avert his downfal, or at least to mitigate the exasperation of his adversaries. The tone and spirit of this address are so congenial to the mild wisdom of the Primate, that the composition of it has been ascribed to him, with the highest degree of probability[1].

Letter to the Council, on behalf of the Protector, from Cranmer, Sir W Paget, and Sir T. Smith.

In this letter, he begins by representing the frightful dangers to which the kingdom was exposed by these hateful dissensions among its guardians and protectors. " If," he says, " all private interests are not instantly postponed to the safety of the commonwealth,

[1] Strype, Cranmer, b. ii. c. 12.

and of the royal person, as verily as God is God, our King, our country, and ourselves, must be utterly destroyed and cast away. For the passion of Jesus Christ, therefore, so use your wisdom, and temper your determination, that on either side no blood be shed, nor cruelty be practised. For if things should come to this extremity, both you and we are likely soon to behold, with our own eyes, that which at every vein of our hearts we shall bleed to look upon. As true subjects to the King, as faithful, though unworthy counsellors to his Majesty and the realm, yea, as lamentable petitioners, we beseech you to have compassion on your Sovereign, and his kingdom, of which you are yourselves the principal members. We speak this, not out of private and personal fear. We speak advisedly, from our own knowledge of facts and circumstances; with which (under favour be it spoken) we are much more perfectly acquainted than yourselves. In thus appealing to you, we are prompted solely by our devotion to the service of God, the King, and his people; and, with this consciousness, we rest in quiet expectation of the event. As for the Protector, he has but little care to retain the high station to which he has solemnly been called; but he deems it not reasonable tô be thrust from it with ignominy and violence. Still less reasonable does he think it, that he should be expected to place himself *simply* in your hands, without first hearing the proposed conditions of his surrender. If it be true, that you seek his life, your sanguinary designs perchance may drive him to extremities; and if so, the

blood that shall be shed will justly be required at your hands. Cast away, therefore, we beseech you, all such pernicious thoughts, and listen to the counsels of kindness and humanity. No man can charge the Protector with cruelty; and we hope that the same may justly be said of his adversaries: and, in that case, you may be assured that he is ready to meet you, in a spirit of equity and moderation [1]."

Such was the substance of this address to the Lords who had arrayed themselves against the Regent, and were impatient for his destruction. The result was little better than a hollow truce between them. He was deprived of the Protectorate, though restored to his seat in the Council; and he gave his daughter, the Lady Jane Seymour, in marriage to Lord Dudley, the son of his inveterate enemy. Eighteen months afterwards he was brought to the block!

Hopes of the Romanists defeated by the vigilance of Cranmer.

The disgrace of Somerset had one effect, which called for the vigilance and activity of the Primate: it revived the spirits of the Romish party, and tempted them to hope for the restoration of the Services, which had recently been superseded. The influence of the Protector had been eminently useful to the Reformers; and the decay of the same influence, the Papists were willing to believe, would be followed by an

[1] This letter is dated from Windsor Castle, Oct. 10, 1549. The whole of it is printed from Stow, in Todd's Cranmer, vol. ii. p. 157—161.

immediate return to the ancient principles and habits. These expectations were promptly extinguished by the vigilant energy of the Archbishop. A letter, drawn up most probably by himself, was speedily addressed, in the name of the King and Council, to the Bishops, fatal to all hopes of a revival of the Romish formularies. This document begins by setting forth, that since the apprehension of the Duke, a report had been circulated, of the probable restoration of "the old Latin Service, and the conjured bread and water," as if the new ritual had been exclusively his act. And, in order to put away such vain expectation, it strictly enjoins the Bishops, to send orders to the Clergy of their dioceses, for delivering up into their hands all Popish books of devotion, which might be a hindrance to the use of the Common Prayer, with a view to their being "abolished and defaced," and rendered unfit for further use. It moreover commands the punishment of such obstinate persons, as shall refuse to pay for the bread and wine necessary for the administration of the Sacrament according to the order of the new service-book [1]. This Ordinance was signed by Cranmer, by the Chancellor Lord Rich, and by four others of the Council, and was speedily followed up by an Act of Parliament, to the same effect [2]. An exception, however,

Order for abolishing the Popish books of devotion.

[1] Burnet, vol. ii. Rec. No. 47. The date of this letter is Dec. 25, 1549.

[2] 3 and 4 Edw. VI. c. 10.

was introduced into this Statute, in favour of the Primer of 1545; but with the proviso, that the sentences of invocation, or prayer to Saints, should be blotted out from the copies. The same Act contains a clause for the destruction of all images which had been taken out of churches or chapels; but allows the retention of such images or figures, as formed either part or ornament of tombs or monuments, and had never been abused to superstitious purposes. These vigorous measures effectually suppressed the belief, that the disgrace of Somerset implied, on the part of the Government, any change of purpose at all favourable to the views of the Romish party.

New Formulary for Ordination.

The next step towards the completion of the fabric of the Reformed Church, was the compilation of a formulary for conferring holy orders on her ministers. In spite of the determined opposition of the Bishop of Durham, and several other Prelates, an Act had been passed, in the preceding year, to authorise the preparation of such a Ritual, and to give it validity, to the exclusion of every other[1]. This was an advance, in several respects, of eminent importance. In the first place, it expunged the five inferior orders of the ministry,—the readers, the subdeacons, the exorcists, the acolyths[2], the doorkeepers; all of which had been introduced, in ancient times indeed, but purely by

[1] 3 and 4 Edw. VI. c. 12.

[2] The word acolyth is only a corruption of the Greek word ἀκόλουθος, signifying *an attendant*.

Ecclesiastical institution, as the Christian worship declined from its original simplicity. Secondly, a multitude of pantomimic rites were wholly discarded from the rubric of the new ordinal; the use of gloves and sandals,—of mitre, ring, and crozier,—the anointing with chrism, or consecrated unguent,—the delivery of the chalice and the paten for the holy elements,—and with it, of the power to offer sacrifice to God, and to celebrate masses for the living and the dead. Nothing of outward ceremony was retained, but the imposition of hands, both by the attendant Presbyters, as well as the Bishop; and the delivery of the Bible to the candidate for ordination to the Priesthood: the first of them of undoubted Apostolic institution[1], the latter impressively significant of the principal duty of a Christian minister. Thirdly, nothing was suffered to remain, which implied that an indelible character was *sacramentally* impressed on the soul of the receiver, by virtue of which he became a depositary of the prerogative of forgiveness. Lastly, the formulary was important, as indicating that the Primate had divested himself of certain peculiar notions relative to the dignity of the Episcopal function[2]; for it fully recognized the distinction between the three offices of Bishop, Presbyter, and Deacon; it assigned to the Bishop the superiority which belonged to him, as one who was charged with the exercise of discipline, and the government of a diocese; and it was framed upon the principle that no holy office can be

[1] 1 Tim. iv. 14. [2] See vol. i. p. 240, 241.

duly conferred, without the episcopal sanction and ministration. By these judicious measures, the golden chain of Apostolical succession was preserved in our Church unbroken; and, at the same time, it was cleared from the spots with which the breath of superstition had tarnished its purity and lustre.

The Act of Parliament which sanctioned this change, prescribed the 1st of April, 1550, as the day after which all other forms of ordination were to be superseded by the new one. The Archbishop had, nevertheless, anticipated the operation of the Statute. In the preceding year, he celebrated a great Ordination of Priests and Deacons, at which Bishop Ridley assisted. The candidates were, most of them, well disposed to the proceedings of the King, and his Reforming Council; and willingly received their sacred commission according to the formulary which had then been recently prepared, although it could not, as yet, be generally enforced. This occasion is extremely interesting,—partly, as one memorable stage in the progress of improvement; and partly, because the persons then admitted to the ministry, were signally qualified for the office of spreading the knowledge of Scriptural Christianity through the land. It was likewise remarkable on a far less gratifying account; for it was here that Protestant non-conformity may be said to have taken up its first regular position. Among the learned and excellent men, on whom the Archbishop laid his hands, there were several who had been entangled by scru-

First appearance of non-conformity, in opposition to the sacerdotal habits.

ples relative to the lawfulness of the ancient sacerdotal habiliments. These unhappy misgivings they brought with them to the altar. In consideration of the substantial worth and excellence of these men, their exceptions were indulgently allowed; and they were admitted to holy orders without contaminating themselves (for so they deemed it) with the shreds and fragments of Popery! Trifling as this occurrence may appear, it swells into calamitous importance, when we contemplate it as an eruption of the schismatical spirit, which, from that time, has never ceased to afflict and torment the Protestant Church of England.

Learned foreigners entertained by Cranmer.

But to return to the efforts of the Primate for aiding the progress of sound Scriptural divinity:—among the expedients liberally resorted to by him for this purpose, was the entertainment of learned Protestants from the continent. Melancthon had received repeated invitations from England, during the former reign; and even Henry himself had been desirous of fixing him in this country. For some time previous to the period now under consideration, Cranmer had no less than seven distinguished foreigners domesticated in his palace at Lambeth; among whom were Martin Bucer, Paulus Fagius, Peter Martyr, and Bernardine Ochinus. His letter of invitation to Bucer (who was then in trouble and danger, in consequence of the promulgation of the Interim,) is a model of Christian benevolence and cour-

tesy[1]. This learned Alsatian was destined by him for the theological chair of Cambridge, and Fagius for the professorship of Hebrew, for which stations their respective attainments most eminently qualified them. For a quarter of a year they had remained at Lambeth, engaged in close preparation for their approaching lectures. Unhappily, the Church of England was not destined to enjoy the full benefit which the Primate had anticipated, both from their industry, and their moderation. Fagius was seized with a distemper which soon proved mortal, and expired in the middle of November, 1549; and Bucer followed him to a better world, in February, 1551.

Martin Bucer appointed to the theological chair at Cambridge; Peter Martyr at Oxford.

The theological professorship of Oxford was assigned to Peter Martyr, a Florentine of conspicuous erudition, who had renounced his monastic vows, and was consequently compelled to abandon his country. His appearance at the University was the signal for hostility and tumult. Some feelings of jealousy at the appointment of a foreigner to the chair, might have been pardonable. But Martyr soon found that he had something worse to encounter than scowling looks, and murmurs of discontent. He was chained, as it were, to the stake, and destined to endure the

Disputations at Oxford and Cambridge, on the Eucharist.

[1] It is printed in the Appendix, No. 43, to Strype's Cranmer. Also in the Appendix to this volume, No. 2.

baiting of exasperated polemics. On his first public introduction, the Schools of Oxford became a scene of uproar, such as would almost have disgraced a seditious rabble. When he took the chair, for the purpose of lecturing, they insisted that he should dispute. Nothing could well surpass the intrepid bearing, and dignified self-possession of the Italian, in the midst of these ungenerous assaults. In spite of clamorous interruption, he completed his Lecture. And when, at length, a time was appointed for disputation, with the sanction of the Privy Council, he stood alone, for four days together, against a succession of adversaries; and fully vindicated, by the mastery of his learning, the choice which had fixed him in so arduous a post.

The subject of the contest was the inexhaustible question of Transubstantiation; and it was followed by a similar debate at Cambridge, at which Ridley and Holbeach were the chief persons who presided. A lengthened notice of these tedious polemical discussions [1] is wholly incompatible with our present design. I cannot, however, forbear to lay before the reader a portion of the speech, with which the disputation at Oxford was closed by Dr. Cox. It contains, indeed, nothing which can be called a *determination* of the question; but, in language dictated by the wisdom

[1] A very full account of the Oxford and Cambridge Disputations is given by Foxe, vol. ii. b. ix. p. 100—129. Ed. 1684. The arguments of the Romish party at Oxford are omitted by him.

which is pure and peaceable, it strongly recommends abstinence from debate upon it. "I beseech you, both the aged and the young," he says, "by the mercies of God, and as you value your salvation, that you would lay aside those controversies which, for many ages, have embroiled and distracted the Church of Christ about Transubstantiation, and I know not what carnal presence. There is no end of such discussions. These are no other than the snares of the Devil, in which he is perpetually entangling us, and holding us back from genuine piety. Let us, as becometh true Christian men, consider principally, or rather solely, what Christ hath done, and what he hath commanded us to do. Let us keep in mind, that these are the sacred and awful mysteries of Christ; and let us, accordingly, use them for our salvation, and approach them with fear and trembling. Let us never come near them unworthily, lest we receive them to our condemnation [1]." Had this spirit always presided over the meditations and inquiries of men, relative to the Sacramental mysteries, the precise manner of the Saviour's presence in those mysteries might have well been suffered to remain undefined,—the world might have been relieved from monumental piles of controversy,—and the Church might have been spared the misery and the disgrace of long centuries of persecution.

Unfortunately, however, the Papal Priesthood never would suffer their favourite dogma to re-

[1] Strype. Cranm. Append. No. 44.

pose in the sanctuary of each man's individual conscience. They never could endure that it should remain in obscurity and inaction. They insisted on its coming forth to the light of day, as the most active and powerful principle of their spiritual dominion: and further, they connected it with certain other *strong delusions*, which rendered it, in their hands, not only adverse to all freedom of conscience, but dangerous to personal holiness and virtue. In the first place,—here is a system of belief which invests Ecclesiastics with the power of calling down, at any moment, the Deity from heaven,—of placing their congregations in his immediate and local presence,—of separating qualities and accidents from their substances,—and exhibiting the qualities to human sense, after the substance has been withdrawn. In other words,—a succession of mortal men are armed with powers so stupendously miraculous, as, in effect, almost to convert them into Gods, and to clothe them with unlimited and terrific power over the minds of all believers. Here is a secret, such as Priestcraft never before, in the history of the world, had pretended to possess; a secret, too, which Romish priestcraft so highly valued, that it persecuted all denial, or even doubt of it, as the most atrocious of impieties. Again,—the doctrine of Transubstantiation must never be separated from another, with which, indeed, it is most intimately connected; namely, that the operation of the present Deity, in conferring grace on the communicant, can-

Reflections on the Question.

not be defeated but by the resistance of a mind bent, at the moment, upon actual sin. The immediate and practical effect, therefore, of this persuasion is, to relax the vigilant and anxious self-examination by which the Protestant is required to prepare himself for the table of the Lord ; and thus to deprive Christian faith and virtue of one of their most effective safeguards. It must, lastly, be recollected, that the belief in propitiatory masses was a very natural progeny of a belief in the corporeal presence ; and it will hardly be maintained, that human craft has ever devised a happier expedient than this, for keeping mankind down in a double servitude to the tyranny of their own passions, and to the power of their spiritual masters.

In contending, therefore, against the sacramental doctrines of the Church of Rome, the English Reformers felt that they were not grappling with an innocuous theory, but that they were fighting the battle of mankind against the dominion of imposture. They perceived that the contest was one which they were not at liberty to decline, without a surrender of the whole life and virtue of their cause. Such was the spirit of the times, that compromise and conciliation were specious but impracticable things. Any attempt to escape from the pressure of what were considered as great and critical questions, was sure to be rewarded with the sarcasm and the sneer, which the world is always ready to bestow on infamous neutrality. And hence it was thus, at one time, the mode-

ration of Martin Bucer, procured for him little but the contempt both of Protestant and Romanist[1]. That our own Reformers, however, were well disposed to conciliation, with regard to the doctrine of the Eucharist, is evident from the tenour of our sacramental service. It may not, perhaps, altogether *satisfy* the conscience of a Roman Catholic; but, from the beginning to the end of it, there is not one syllable which can afflict or disturb his conscience. Even those portions of the office, which relate to the consecration, and the administration of the elements, are so framed, that a Romanist might join in them, without the slightest compromise of any one article of his creed.

Progress of Spoliation.

While Cranmer was labouring, both in his own person, and by his judicious and liberal patronage, to make the Reformation honourable, others were, unhappily, active in loading it with ignominy. The plunder of Church property has repeatedly been noticed in this narrative; and, indeed, it is very difficult for the historian to avert his eyes from it, for a moment, in his progress through this eventful period. The reign of Edward was, if possible, more infamous for this "*dividing of the spoil*," than that of his predecessor. The Royal Lion, who had filled his den with ravin, was now, indeed, removed; but the only consequence was, that the meaner beasts of prey flew upon their game in greater numbers, and with more shameless licence. It is

[1] See Jortin's Life of Erasmus, vol. i. p. 390. Ed. 1808.

needless to iterate, that Cranmer never ceased to lift up his own testimony against the work of desecration [1]. He was now fain to request, that the voice of a foreigner might be raised against the lust of rapine, which was the disgrace of his age, and a "cleaving curse" upon his country [2]. By his desire it was, that Martin Bucer, in the present year, gave vent to his religious indignation, in a letter to the Marquis of Dorset.

Martin Bucer's Protest against the plunder of the Church.

"It hath been well said," he exclaims, "that no one ever grew rich by the pillage of private or of public property. What sense of God can that man have who hopes that permanent wealth can be built up by the hands of sacrilege [3]. We are perpetually told

[1] In the eighth chapter of the first volume of this work, the project of Cranmer for converting the Cathedrals into Seminaries of Theology and Literature, has been generally noticed. The application of his views to his own Cathedral may be seen in detail in p. 291, of the 4th vol. of his Remains, in the late Oxford edition; Lett. 204, and note (b). From this letter it appears that he was by no means influenced by any bigoted attachment to ancient abuses. His estimate of the Prebendaries of those days, is very far from respectful: and his only anxiety seems to have been, that the revenues of the Church should be dedicated to the advancement of learning and religion. His letter is addressed to Cromwell, and is dated 29th Nov. 1539.

[2] See post, note p. 43, towards the end of this chapter.

[3] It is remarked by Mr. Blunt, in his Sketch of the Reformation, that this ill gotten and ill applied wealth often verified the adage, that "the Devil's corn goes all to bran." And, in support of this maxim, he produces the observation of Sir H. Spelman, in 1616, that, on comparing the mansion houses of twenty-four families of Gentlemen in Norfolk, with as many monasteries, all

that the riches of the Church are inordinately great, and minister to nothing but the luxury of idle and unprofitable Churchmen. If this be so, then let the drones be driven out of the hive; but why should wasps and hornets be let in, to gorge themselves on its stores? Learned and laborious men are the rightful successors of those who have abused the revenue of the Church; for else she will have nothing but beggary to offer to them that toil in her ministry; and the result must be, the universal decay both of literature and piety." Such was the tenour of this memorable remonstrance [1]. The pith and marrow of it, was summed up in a few quaint words, delivered this year by Latimer in the presence of the King: "Thus much I say unto you Magistrates,—if ye will not maintain Schools and Universities, ye shall have a *brutality*." The prospect of a *brutality*, however,

standing together at the Dissolution, and all lying within a ring of twelve miles in semi-diameter, he found the former still possessed by the lineal descendants of their original occupants, *in every instance;* while the latter, with two exceptions only, had flung out their owners again and again,—*some, six times over, none less than three,*—through sale, through default of issue, and very often through great and grievous disasters. The same opinion had been maintained by Whitgift, in his Appeal to Queen Elizabeth, against the Sacrilegious designs of Leicester and others, in which he challenges this as a truth, "already become visible in many families, that Church land, added to an ancient and just inheritance, hath proved like a moth fretting a garment, and secretly consumed both." Various other testimonies to the same truth are produced by Mr. Blunt. Sketch of the Reform. &c. pp. 145, 146.

[1] Strype's Cranmer, b. ii. c. 16.

had but small terror in the sight of men, having eyes full of covetousness, and that could not cease from spoil. The march of iniquity, accordingly, swept onward. Of the progress which it had made already, some notion may be formed from the facts, that Cromwell had held the Deanery of Wells,—that the Protector himself had long been the Leviathan of Pluralists, absorbing the Deanery, the Treasurership, and four of the best Prebendal Stalls in a Cathedral church,—that his son had a pension of 300*l.*, (probably much more than equal to 1500*l.* of our present money,) out of the revenues of a Bishopric,—that rewards and honours due to piety and scholarship, were intercepted by laymen,—and that learning began to droop, and the Universities to wear an aspect of impoverishment and desolation. These evils had been represented to the Archbishop, so long ago as 1547, with admirable feeling and eloquence, by Roger Ascham, the Public Orator of Cambridge [1]. But to remonstrate with the plunderers, was like speaking of abstinence to famished wolves and vultures. That the evil still continued without abatement, is abundantly evident from a single example. In the course of this very year, when Ridley—now advanced to the See of London—was about to bestow a Prebend on Grindal, he received a letter from the Council to stop the collation: and the reason which that body had the effrontery to offer, was, that, truly,

[1] See Burnet, vol. ii. p. 8; and Strype's Cranmer, b. ii. c. 6, and App. No. 38.

the profits of that preferment were wanted for the maintenance of his Majesty's stables [1]. There was, in truth, no meanness of plunder to which the great men of those days did not willingly stoop. They condescended to lay their hands, not only on the silver and gold, but on the brass and the lead [2]. Both the Primate and Ridley incurred their displeasure for resisting "the spoil of Church goods, taken away by command of the higher powers, without any order of law or justice, and without any request, or consent of them to whom they belong." It is truly wonderful that the spirit of Cranmer and his colleagues could bear them stiffly up under these dis-

[1] Burnet, vol. iii. p. 197. Ann. 1550.

[2] Todd's Cranmer, vol. ii. p. 184.—We may find a just representation of this unhallowed and sordid rapacity, under the Pagan images of Juvenal:

Confer et hos, veteris qui tollunt grandia Templi
Pocula adorandæ robiginis, et populorum
Dona, vel antiquo positas a rege coronas.
Hæc ibi si non sunt, minor extat sacrilegus, qui
Radat inaurati femur Herculis, et faciem ipsam
Neptuni, vel bracteolam de Castore ducat.
An dubitet,—solitus totum conflare Tonantem?—Sat. xiii.

Bold sacrilege, invading things divine,
Breaks through a temple, or destroys a shrine;
The reverend goblets, and the ancient plate,
Those grateful offerings of a conquering state,
Or pious King;—or, if the shrine be poor,
The image spoils: nor is the God secure.
One seizes Neptune's beard,—one, Castor's crown,—
Or Jove himself, and melts the Thunderer down!—CREECH.

couragements. The assaults of an enemy are apt to awaken in us the principle of endurance. But when oppression is inflicted by friends and advocates, the heart begins to sicken, almost unto death.

That the agents of evil will often hover near the march of improvement, was further manifested during this reign, by the plunder, the dispersion, and even the total destruction of many a valuable library. This was a species of barbarism which burst forth originally on the dissolution of the Monasteries. It seemed to be thought, that the volumes which were found in Popish repositories, could be worthy of no other fate than that which awaited Popery itself: and hence it was the quadrangles of colleges were often strewed with the tattered fragments of Scotus and Peter Lombard. And the havoc would probably have been still more wasteful and indiscriminate, if Henry had not partially arrested it by a commission to Leland, which empowered him to examine and preserve a multitude of records, manuscripts, and other literary treasures. That the mischief was still actively at work in the reign of Edward, is clear from the urgent remonstrance on the subject addressed to him by Bale, afterwards the Bishop of Ossory. And, long afterwards, the Antiquarian of Oxford, deplores that, in 1550, many precious volumes "guilty of no other superstition but red letters in their fronts or titles," were brought out to the market-place, and consigned to the flames[1]. That the Reformation

[1] See Todd's Cranmer, vol. ii. p. 181—187.

should have to endure the infamy of all this vandalism, is by no means surprising. But it is certain that none lamented it more passionately than our Reformers, and that none laboured more zealously than they did to suppress it. It is not to be supposed that the "funeral of Scotus" (as the fanatics termed the above stupid solemnity,) could be regarded by the patrons of literary freedom, with any other feelings than those of contempt and disgust.

Bishop Hoper's refusal of the Episcopal habits.

Another source of affliction to Cranmer and his Associates, was the spirit of dissension that had long been spreading among the Reformers, and dissipating their strength: and his regrets must have been deepened by the appearance of a party, in his own country, which was threatening to unfurl the standard of nonconformity. Of this party, Bishop Hoper may reasonably be selected as the prototype. Hoper was among the Divines who had been driven from England by the persecution of the Six Articles: and during his residence among the Protestants of Germany and England, the publication of the Interim had engaged him in deep consideration of the question, how far a compliance with things indifferent in themselves, may be consistent with Christian sincerity. Unhappily, he adopted the more scrupulous doctrines of the Helvetic Divines; and returned to England full of antipathy to the vanities of the clerical apparel. However, as he was a searching and faithful preacher of the gospel, the Primate was extremely anxious for his promotion to the bench.

The See of Gloucester accordingly was offered him; and then it was that his rigorous casuistry began to scatter abroad the seeds of future trouble. He positively refused to wear the Episcopal dress; and, according to some accounts, he raised considerable difficulty either with regard to the oath of canonical obedience, or the oath of submission to the Royal Supremacy. It has been stated above, that when certain candidates for Holy Orders had declined the usual habit, the Archbishop treated their scruples with respect and indulgence; a sufficient evidence of his natural tendency to moderation. But when this fastidious humour was on the point of being, as it were, visibly embodied, in the person of a Father of the Church, Cranmer felt it quite impossible for him to consult any longer his desire of compromise and peace; and he, consequently, refused to consecrate the recusant. The influence of the Earl of Warwick was employed to shake this resolution. Nay—the King himself addressed a letter to the Primate, in which he offered him a dispensation from all the penalties and forfeitures which might be incurred by the omission of circumstances offensive to the conscience of the intended Bishop. Cranmer, in reply, besought that he might not be urged to render obedience to his Sovereign, by a breach of his own laws. Hoper, on the other hand, was equally inflexible: and a controversy on the lawfulness of the Episcopal habiliments was the result of this unhappy difference of opinion.

Cranmer's firmness, in opposition to the scruples of Hoper.

Both Cranmer and Hoper were desirous, on this

occasion, of ascertaining the views of the learned foreigners who were then in England. The notions of John Alasco, a distinguished native of Poland, were decidedly favourable to the scrupulous side of the question. The Archbishop consulted Martin Bucer. Hoper resorted to the opinion of Peter Martyr, with whom he held rather a lengthened correspondence. The questions submitted to Bucer were, First, whether the Ministers of the Church of England may use the customary garments, prescribed by the magistrates, without offence to God: Secondly, whether, to affirm the unlawfulness of the garments, or to refuse the use of them, be a sin against God, or the magistrate;—against God, in declaring that to be unclean which he hath sanctified; against the magistrate, in resisting a public ordinance. The answer of Bucer to each of these questions was manfully in the affirmative; but he held that, for avoiding offence, and repressing superstition, it might be well that some future occasion should be taken for discontinuing the offensive habits. The judgment of Peter Martyr must have been as little satisfactory to Hoper as that of Bucer. He held, that the garments in question were purely matters of indifference—that a time might come when they might be safely cast aside—but that to disuse them now, as if they were symbols of impiety, might unsettle the minds of all, and unfit them for the reception either of reasonable ceremonies, or of solid doctrine. He, also, tenders some advice which indicates that the zeal of his correspondent was apt to outstrip his discretion in more essential mat-

ters: for he recommends him to take heed lest the usefulness of his ministry should be impaired by the unseasonable bitterness of his sermons. The two primary objections of Hoper were that, to use the Sacerdotal vesture, was to recall the Priesthood of Aaron: and, what was still worse, to adopt an invention of Antichrist. To these strange fancies Martyr replied, that there could be no end of obliterating the vestiges of the old law, discernible, from the most ancient times, in the institutions of the Christian Church; as, for instance, in the festivals of the Resurrection—of Pentecost—and of the death of Christ, &c. He further observed, that to stigmatize every thing Popish as a device of Antichrist, would involve such a multitude of prohibitions, as would bring the Church into a state of bondage nearly as grievous as that from which she had escaped. Hoper contended that the trappings of public worship would divert the attention of the people from the essence of it,—that whatsoever was not of faith, was sin,—that nothing could be safely adopted without the sanction of Scripture. To this, the answer was, that sober and reasonable solemnities might rather fix, than dissipate the attention of the worshipper, and that it was partly with this view that the Sacraments themselves were probably ordained;—that to the clean all things are clean;—and that the Scriptures assure us, that indifferent things never can defile a sincere mind or a pure conscience.—In spite of all this salutary counsel, Hoper remained untractable. He was first ordered by the Council to confine himself to his house,

and to abstain from publishing his opinions. Instead of complying, he put forth his *confession of faith*, and went about complaining of the Counsellors of the King. He was then committed to the gentle custody of the Archbishop, with no better success. According to our modern notions, the only way of dealing with such an incorrigible non-conformist would be, to give up all further thoughts of making the man a Bishop. In those days, however, they had a very different method of proceeding. Finding that "he could not be brought to any conformity, and that he sought to prescribe orders, instead of receiving them," the Council committed him to the Fleet! The result of his six weeks' meditation there, was a partial compliance with the usages of the Church. He was consecrated on the 8th March, in the Episcopal rochet and chimere, and consented to appear with this habit, and the square cap, in his own Cathedral, and on public occasions. How his conscience could be pacified by this sort of compromise, it is not very easy to understand. If the practice were, in his judgment, sinful, one can hardly perceive how its guilt could be greatly palliated, by confining the adoption of it to scenes and places of the most conspicuous solemnity [1].

Jan. 27, 1551.

Hoper's compromise.

With regard to his aversion for the prelatical habit, there is, perhaps, something more to be said

[1] Strype's Cranmer, b. ii. c. 17, where a full account may be seen of this unfortunate contention.

than may immediately occur to the reader. That part of the dress, which in our days consists of black satin, in Hoper's time was of *scarlet* silk. It is difficult to imagine any thing better fitted to exasperate the prejudices of a sturdy, and somewhat fanatical, Reformer, than the sight of this fiery remnant of Pontifical bravery. Had the judicious change, which was introduced in the reign of Elizabeth, been adopted before Hoper's consecration, perhaps his scruples might have been rather less unmanageable.

Communion Tables substituted for Altars.

It was, of course, not to be expected that the man whose conscience revolted against the finery of the Romish Church, would patiently endure the continuance of Altars in the celebration of the Sacrament. In the early part of the year 1550, Hoper had, accordingly, represented to the Court, that it would be more conformable to primitive institution, if altars were turned into tables; seeing that so long as altars should remain, the ignorant people, and the equally ignorant or mis-persuaded priest, would always dream of sacrifices. His scruples on this point were far more reasonable than those which made the habits an abomination in his sight: for they related to a matter in which a most important principle was involved. On this occasion, therefore, he met with the support both of the Archbishop and of Ridley, who had succeeded Boner in the See of London [1]. The latter of these Prelates lost no time in carrying the views of

[1] Burnet, vol. ii. p. 158, 159; and Rec. No. 52.

Hoper into effect. At his primary Visitation, in June, he issued an injunction that altars should be removed, and that tables should be placed in their stead, "in order that the simple might be turned from the old superstition of the Mass, to the right use of the Lord's Supper." And here, unfortunately, were sown the seeds of another controversy, which continued to rage occasionally for upwards of a century. To us, who "dream of sacrifices" no longer, it is a matter of profound indifference whether the word Altar or Table be used, with reference to the Sacramental solemnity. But in those days, the case was widely different. The proposed innovation was one, which, in the estimate of the Romanists, amounted to an open abandonment of the doctrine, that every celebration of the Eucharist is no less than a fresh offering of the great Sacrifice; and, for that reason, it was vehemently resisted by the adherents of the old belief. The consequence of this opposition was, that the kingdom was disturbed, from one end of it to the other, with an unseemly diversity of practice, in this particular; so that it became necessary to suppress the dissension by public authority. For this purpose, a mandate was issued by the Council, to the Bishops, enjoining a general conformity to the order recently established in the Diocese of London. The first of the recusants against it was Day, the Bishop of Chichester, who from the first had openly declared his determination to disobey it. The arguments and remonstrances of Cranmer, and the other Pro-

Nov. 1550.

testant Bishops, were wholly insufficient to overpower his objections; and, as usual in those times, he was sent to reflect upon the matter in the Fleet. His ruminations in prison produced no change in his resolution; and, before the end of the next year, he was deprived of his Bishopric. His disgrace was of no long duration. On the accession of Mary he was restored to his rank and office, and proved, by his actions, that he had thoroughly repented of all his compliances with the Reformation[1]. Hethe, Bishop of Worcester, was the companion of his sufferings. This Prelate had been under confinement since the spring of 1549, for his refusal to subscribe the Ordinal, which had. then, been recently set forth. And when, at last, he was urgently recommended by the Council to reconsider his determination, he not only declared that his mind was irrevocably made up, with regard to the new Ordination Service, but, further, that there were various other matters to which he never would consent; and that the substitution of Altars for Tables was among them: and, like Bishop Day, he resolutely sacrificed his Bishopric to his nonconformity. These

December.

[1] He was very active in the persecution of the Protestants; and was one of the Commissioners who sat in judgment upon Bishop Hoper, whom he scornfully reproached for his *hypocrisy!* It must have required no ordinary powers of impudence in this man to give utterance to such charge; for he had conformed to all the measures of Henry VIII., though he afterwards plainly avowed to Bradford, the Martyr, that, all along, "it went against his conscience."—Strype's Cranmer, b. ii. c. 20.

occurrences must have been a source of deep regret to the Primate. He had been the original patron of these two Prelates: but they could never forgive their benefactor, for his change of opinion on the Sacramental doctrine [1].

Proceedings against Gardiner.

While the public mind was disturbed by these contentions, the great agitator of all, Bishop Gardiner, was a prisoner in the Tower. He had been sent thither by the Council, in 1548, in consequence of his turbulent and contumacious demeanour. One grand object of the government was to extort from him a public declaration from the pulpit, of the competency of the King to exercise the Royal power, while he was yet under age. This demand he constantly evaded. It was a maxim, diligently circulated among his party, that the supremacy of the King is so far in abeyance, during his minority, that it cannot be exerted for the purpose of effecting any change of the existing laws. The notion was extravagantly absurd; for a case might happen, in which the effect of it would be to suspend nearly the whole business of legislation for a period of 16 or 18 years! It was, however, so incomparably adapted for the designs of the Roman Catholic faction, that they appeared to take their stand upon it, as the most advantageous position from which they could harass and impede the march of their adversaries. And there were some among them who seemed anxious to fortify it by the application

[1] Strype's Cranmer, b. ii. c. 20.

of another principle; namely, that the enlightening grace conveyed to the Lord's Anointed, at the solemnity of his coronation, could not develope itself until he should reach the years of manhood and discretion[1]. They were, therefore, loud in their professions of ready submission to the supremacy of the King; but, at the same time, they protested, that they were under no obligation to acknowledge the supremacy of the Council. It will easily be perceived, how embarrassing and how dangerous such maxims as these must have been to the existing government; more especially at a time when the banners of insurrection were waving in so many provinces of the kingdom. They amounted to very little short of disguised rebellion. Considered, therefore, with reference to the circumstances of the times, the imprisonment of this very untractable churchman may perhaps be regarded as an act of excusable severity. But be this as it may, this proceeding entirely failed to break the spirit of Gardiner. He persisted in demanding a legal trial; and at length, after he had been about two years in the Tower, the Council resolved that he should be examined by a commission, consisting of the Primate, the Bishops of London, Ely, and Lincoln, Secretary Sir William Petre, Judge Hales, and two Masters in Chancery; and this was the first stage of the business, in which the Archbishop had any prominent or important share. The proceedings of the Commissioners furnished Gardiner

[1] Burnet, vol. ii. p. 70. ed. 1681.

with an opportunity of exhibiting his mastery in the artifices of defensive warfare; and it was not till after two-and-twenty sessions, that they pronounced him contumacious, and declared his Bishopric void[1].

Degradation of Gardiner. 14th Feb. 1551.

The ground of this sentence was the refusal of Gardiner to subscribe certain Articles, embracing all the most important points of the Reformation, up to that time; and, consequently, involving a virtual abandonment of the favourite position of the Romanists, that the power of making changes was suspended by the minority of the King. But here the crafty Prelate resorted to one of his customary stratagems. He was anxious to have it believed, that, from first to last, he was persecuted for nothing but his inflexible fidelity to the *Catholic* faith, in its main doctrine of the corporeal presence. The articles preferred against him furnished him with a plausible opportunity of producing this impression; for among other things, he was accused of having declared "divers judgments and opinions on the Sacrament of the Altar, to the manifest contempt of his High-

[1] These Sessions were held between the 15th of December, 1550, and the 14th of February, 1551. Dr. Lingard, *without noticing the number of the Sessions*, affirms that "Cranmer *cut short the proceedings*, and pronounced Gardiner contumacious." Hist. Eng. vol. vii. p. 87. 8vo. After two-and-twenty sessions, it was high time the proceedings should be *cut short* by some decision or other. An account of the whole proceedings against Gardiner may be seen in Burnet, vol. ii. p. 68—70. 150, 151. 165; and Strype's Cranmer, b. ii. c. 19.

ness's inhibitions." In reply to this charge, he produced the book which he had recently composed in prison, in answer to the Primate's recent work upon the Eucharist[1]: and the title prefixed to his work accordingly declared, that it was "made by Steven, Bishop of Winchester, and exhibited by his own hand, for his *defence* to the King's Majesty's Commissioners at Lambeth." Now, in the first place, it was a proceeding of unparalleled effrontery to offer, as a *vindication*, a work in direct opposition to the sentiments of his judges; a proceeding utterly inexplicable on any supposition but one, namely, that the *vindication* was, in effect, addressed not to the King's Commissioners, but to the Roman Catholic portion of the King's subjects. In the second place, (it will scarcely be believed) this "*defence to his Majesty's Commissioners*" was actually completed by Gardiner, before ever *his Majesty's Commissioners* brought him to his trial; and the sentence with which it originally began, was altered by him, after he was summoned, in such a manner as to suit his purpose! That this was so, is distinctly asserted by Cranmer in his formal reply to Gardiner's treatise; and the Archbishop confirms his assertion, by declaring, that he had in his possession a manuscript of the book, in Gardiner's own hand-writing, in which the alteration alluded to plainly appeared. It is further added by Cranmer, that instead of being brought into trouble for his faith in the Sacrament, Gardiner was called

[1] This work of Cranmer's will be noticed in the next chapter.

before the Commission at his own "importunate suit and procurement;" and was there required to answer for his contempt of the King's authority, or rather, for his manifest rebellion against it, and that for this cause he was degraded from his station[1].

In spite, however, of his impudence and duplicity, it was felt, even at that time, that the Bishop of Winchester was treated with unwarrantable severity. Had he been brought to trial at once for his disobedience to the King, and, upon conviction, been deprived of his bishopric, he would have been in no condition to complain very loudly of the measure. He had been one of the earliest and most vehement champions of the Royal Supremacy; he had consented to hold his bishopric, by patent from the Crown, during pleasure; and there was no intelligible ground for withholding from the Council of Regency the submission which was due to the power of which they were the depositaries. But, instead of this direct mode of proceeding, he was kept in prison for two years, before articles were drawn up against him, or a Commission authorized to try him; and, after his deprivation, he was condemned to a much more rigorous and degrading confinement, than he had suffered previously to the inquiry. All this was thought to savour too rankly of inquisitorial severity. The only palliation that can be offered in behalf of the Government, is, that the spirit of insur-

[1] Strype's Cranmer, b. ii. c. 19. and 25.—Oxford ed. of Cranmer's Remains, vol. iii. p. 35, 36.

rection had been encouraged by the doctrine of resistance to the Council; and that, by obstinately refusing to disclaim that doctrine, Gardiner had administered a most formidable incitement to sedition and bloodshed. It was now, indeed, but too manifest, that although rebellion had been repressed, the confidence of the Romanists was daily gaining strength. The sky was beginning to redden with prognostics, which lowered upon their enemies, but to them were the signs of happier and brighter days. The health of the Royal Minor had begun to show symptoms of premature decay. The Princess who was next in succession was apparently of a firmer constitution than her brother; her devotion to the ancient faith and discipline were inflexible; and her narrowness of mind, and steadiness of purpose, promised to make her an invaluable instrument in their hands. All this while, the counsels of the great and powerful Reformers had been enfeebled by mutual discord. First came the mortal strife between the Lord Admiral and the Protector. Then followed the conflict between the Protector and the rest of the Regency, with its tragical termination. Next was the elevation to the Protectorate, of Dudley, Earl of Warwick, a man notorious for his inordinate ambition, and his arrogant and arbitrary character. And, lastly, may be mentioned the conduct of many of the Protestant nobility, and some even of the Protestant Ecclesiastics, who had long been doing all that men could do to render their cause odious, and themselves contemptible, by showing that their love for the Refor-

Gloomy prospects of the Reformers.

mation was but another name for their lust of spoil[1]. So that it seemed to the adherents of the Romish Communion, as if the pillar which stood between the two camps, was beginning to present its flaming side

[1] There is a long letter, from an English correspondent at Cambridge, to Calvin, dated Whitsunday, 1550, which amply verifies all that has been stated, in various parts of this work, relative to the pernicious agency of that worldly spirit, which was perpetually brooding over the elements of the Reformation. "I greatly fear," says the writer, "that but for the King, Edward VI. and certain other pious individuals, the terrific wrath of God would shortly burst forth against this realm. There has hitherto been no agreement among the Bishops, relative either to doctrine or discipline. Very few parishes are provided with fit ministers, and many of them are *set up to sale to the nobility. There are some even of the Ecclesiastical orders, and of that class, too, which desires to be reckoned Evangelical,* who hold three or four parishes, or more, and yet do not discharge the duties of any one; but place there such substitutes as can be hired at the cheapest rate, and frequently men who are unable to read the services in English, and who, in their hearts, are very Papists. The nobility, in many instances, place over the parishes those who formerly belonged to religious houses, in order to exempt themselves from the payment of the pension reserved to them; and these are generally destitute of learning, and utterly unqualified for the ministry. And hence it is, that you may find many a parish, in which, for several years, a sermon has never been heard." &c. N. Calvino. (Calv. Ep. Op. tom. ix. p. 58, 59. Ed. Amst.) The whole of this afflicting detail is well worth perusal. In a letter of Calvin's to Farellus, dated June 15, 1551, he affirms, that Cranmer had urged him to write frequently to the King himself, on these matters. Ibid. p. 240 (b). The Archbishop's righteous spirit must have been so vexed with these abominations, that he would naturally be glad to call in help against them, from every quarter of Christendom.

towards themselves, while it was becoming as a column of darkness to their enemies. All these things conspired to give them heart and hope, and to strengthen them for a season of endurance, which might probably be short; and which, at the worst, threatened them with no such fiery trials as they were soon to prepare for their adversaries. And, doubtless, they must have been powerfully animated by the example of their great champion, the Prelate of Winchester, who exhibited a constancy worthy of the best cause, though combined with a serpentine craft, that was well adapted only for the worst.

The conduct of Cranmer in the cases of Boner and Gardiner, may perhaps appear to furnish an exception to his usual moderation[1]. It is, indeed, possible that he may have been, beyond measure, anxious to clear the Church of the brutality of the one, and of the dangerous craft and inveterate bigotry of the other: more especially, as the sees they occupied were two of the most important in the kingdom. And if this were so, the feeling is one which may be regarded with some indulgence by all, of either party, except those who can look with complacency on the characters of these two men. But if Gardiner and Boner were now *chastised with whips*, the time was at hand when they would be enabled to retaliate *with scorpions.* And the event showed that the day of vengeance was in their heart!

On Gardiner's degradation, Dr. Ponet, a man of

[1] Burnet, vol. ii. p. 163.

eminent worth and learning, succeeded to the see of Winchester; but he did *not* succeed to its revenues. He was obliged to content himself with an annual pension of 2000 marks, payable from the estates belonging to it[1]; the remainder he *consented* to alienate for the honorable maintenance of certain distinguished individuals about the Court. If, indeed, the alleged superfluity of this opulent see had been destined to relieve the beggary of numbers among the parochial incumbents—or if it had been applied to the furtherance of objects in any way connected with the moral and religious welfare of the nation—there might have been but little reason for impeaching the motives which prompted the reduction. As it was, however, the public, in this instance, gained literally nothing by the impoverishment of the Church. And charity itself can scarcely suppress the suspicion, that the wealth of Gardiner's preferment contributed, most powerfully, to sharpen the indignation of the Court against his manifold delinquencies.

[1] Burnet, vol. ii. p. 165.

CHAPTER XIII.

1550—1552.

Cranmer's "Defence of the true Doctrine of the Sacrament"—Progress of his opinions on it—Great success of his work—Answered by Gardiner and Smythe—Cranmer's Reply to Gardiner—Gardiner's Rejoinder—Visitation of the Chapter of Canterbury—Deprivation of Tonstal—Cranmer protests against it—Revisal of the Common Prayer—Project for an agreement in religious doctrine among Protestants—The design abandoned—Compilation of Forty-two Articles of Religion—Cranmer principally concerned in framing them—Whether the Articles were sanctioned by the Convocation—The necessity of such a Formulary—The Articles not Predestinarian—Cranmer not a Predestinarian—nor a Puritan—The Articles framed chiefly with a view to the contest between Romish and Protestant opinions—Cranmer falsely suspected of covetousness by Cecil—His answer to Cecil.

It has been stated in the preceding chapter, that Gardiner signalized the period of his imprisonment by presenting to his judges a treatise on the Sacrament, in answer to a work on the same subject by Cranmer. The Archbishop's volume was entitled, a "Defence of the True and Catholic Doctrine of the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ, with a confutation of sundry errors concerning the same." As this treatise contains a formal and systematic exposition of his present views upon the subject, and

Cranmer's "Defence of the true doctrine of the Sacrament."

was, in fact, the commencement of a controversy which was carried on by him to the end of his life, it will be necessary to go back, for a while, in order to bestow upon the work the notice which its importance demands.

Progress of his opinions on it.

The whole process by which he attained his final convictions relative to this contested question, appears to have been singularly protracted and painful. There is reason to believe, that the darkness of his mind was first invaded, though but feebly, by the tract of Fryth, the martyr, published so long before as 1533, in answer to Sir Thomas More[1]. This youthful, but very learned divine, had, previously to his execution, undergone a long examination before Cranmer and other Commissioners at Croydon. He is said by Foxe to have shown himself, on that occasion, "passing ready and ripe in answering all objections;" and to have displayed a masterly knowledge of Augustine and the ancient Fathers. The Archbishop was so struck by his accomplishments, that he exclaimed to Hethe, "this man hath wonderfully travailed in this matter; but yet, in mine opinion, he taketh the Doctors amiss." It does not appear, indeed, that the arguments of Fryth made any deep or permanent impression on his mind; for in his letter to Archdeacon Hawkins, dated June, 1533[2], he speaks of him as

[1] Strype's Cranmer, b. i. c. 25.

[2] The same letter in which he describes the coronation of Anne Boleyn. See ante, vol. i. p. 67. It is now printed in the Oxford edition of Cranmer's Remains, p. 27—33.

"one Fryth, which was in the Tower in prison;" and adds, "his opinion was so *notably erroneous*, that we could not despatch him, but were fain to leave him to the determination of his Ordinary, the Bishop of London. His said opinion is of such a nature, that he thought it not necessary to be believed, as an article of our faith, that there is the very corporeal presence of Christ, within the Host and sacrament of the altar; and holdeth, of this point, most after the opinion of Œcolampadius."

From this statement, it is evident that the *heresy* of Fryth was of a negative description. Like Tyndal, and most other men of the *New Learning* at that period, he was willing to "leave the Presence as an indifferent thing, till the matter might be reasoned, in peace and at leisure, of both parties." But his adversaries would hear of no such neutrality. The doctrine of the corporeal and local presence, was the main instrument by which they had been long enabled to rule the whole of Western Christendom: and Fryth, accordingly, perished, because he refused to swear that "the opinion of the Prelates was necessary to be believed, under pain of damnation." His death seems to have bitterly exasperated the controversy. Romanists and Lutherans, who could agree in nothing else, were of one mind in stigmatizing and persecuting the "Sacramentaries:" and the Archbishop was often compelled, by his office in the Church, to become a party to the severities against them. His share in the proceedings against Lambert, was not sufficiently prominent to indicate, with cer-

tainty, the precise complexion of his own opinions relative to the sacramental question. His arguments against that unhappy man, related only to the possible ubiquity of the body of Christ. There is, however, extant a letter of his to Cromwell, dated August 15, 1538, (little more than a month after Lambert's execution) which undoubtedly appears to countenance the opinion, that he had, at that time, abandoned the Romish doctrine, and had embraced the Lutheran notion, of a corporeal presence, without any change in the *substance* of the consecrated elements. In this letter, he is speaking of Adam Damplip, a preacher at Calais, who, when charged with maintaining the Sacramentarian doctrine, protested that he held the very Body and Blood of Christ to be *really* present in the Eucharist, but confuted the opinion of the Transubstantiation: "*and therein*," the Archbishop adds, "*I think he taught but the truth* [1]." It is, indeed, no easy matter to reconcile these words with the express declaration ascribed to Cranmer, in the account of his examination before Brokes, at Oxford, in 1554, namely, that he had taught only *two* contrary doctrines respecting the Sacrament of the Altar, and that, when Lambert was condemned, he maintained the doctrine of the Papists [2]. The only solution of the difficulty seems to be in the suggestion of Foxe, that there is no perfect reliance to be placed in the correctness and impartiality of that Report [3].

[1] Letter 228, Cranmer's Remains, vol. i. p. 257.

[2] Ibid. vol. iv. p. 95, 96. [3] Ibid. p. 89.

But whether Cranmer was ever a Consubstantialist or not, one thing at least is evident,—that his progress towards the truth was slow and cautious. In his answer to Smythe's Preface, he distinctly confesses, that not long before he published the Catechism of Jonas, he was in the error of the Real Presence, (either Romish or Lutheran), as he had been in various others, wherein he had been reared and "*nouseled*" from his youth. But he asserts that, "after it had pleased God to show unto him, by his Holy Word, a more perfect knowledge of his Son Jesus Christ, from time to time, as he grew in knowledge of him, by little and little he put away his former ignorance. And, as God of his mercy, gave him light, so, through his grace, he opened his eyes to receive it, and did not repugn unto God, and remain in darkness [1]." It should further be stated, in justice to his memory, that, although his judicial duties forced him to occasional participation in the proceedings against heresy, he never drank deeply into the ferocious spirit of persecution. On the contrary, he appears to have been generally anxious to mitigate its horrors. He laboured, by repeated conferences, to overcome the scruples of Fryth. He exerted the same good offices towards Joan of Kent, whose notions were considered as at mortal strife with the very essence of Christianity. The mildness of his demeanour, in the disputation with Lambert, was honourably contrasted with the fierceness of his col-

[1] Cranmer's Remains, vol. iii. p. 13, 14.

leagues. And when Damplip, the preacher of Calais, had been examined before him, and Gardiner, and other Commissioners, Cranmer secretly warned him against venturing upon another personal appearance, as it would most probably bring him to a cruel death: in consequence of which benevolent and friendly caution, the *heretic* effected his escape [1].

At what *precise* period the Archbishop finally rejected the opinion of a corporeal presence, it may be difficult to determine. It has been already stated that, for some time previous to the year 1546, his friend Ridley had undertaken a laborious examination of the whole controversy. To this he had been impelled by a perusal of the celebrated work of Bertram: and he rose from his task with a full persuasion that the Romish doctrine was utterly destitute of foundation, either in the words of Scripture, or the belief of the primitive Church. This conviction he expressed to Cranmer, who was thus prompted to a more systematic inquiry than he had yet bestowed upon the subject. Copious manuscript collections of his own are still in existence [2], which may enable us to trace the course of his investigations. And the result of his labours was now given to the world in his "Defence of the true and Catholic Doctrine; grounded and stablished upon God's Holy Word, and

[1] See Cranmer's Remains, vol. i. p. 250, 251, note (h.)

[2] In the Brit. Mus. and in C. C. C. Cambridge. See Strype, Cranm. b. ii. c. 25, and Editor's Pref. to Cranmer's Remains, p. lxxiii. lxxvi. Also vol. ii. p. 291.

approved by the consent of the most ancient Fathers of the Church[1]." From the above statement of the progress of his mind through this labyrinth, the reader may duly estimate the candour and equity of the assertion, current among the Romanists, that "while Latimer leaned on Cranmer, Cranmer himself leaned wholly upon Ridley[2]."

This Disputation is divided into five parts. The *first* part contains an Exposition of the true Doctrine of the Eucharist, and a brief enumeration of the various abuses by which it had been corrupted. The *second* part is devoted to the subject of Transubstantiation; and its object is to show, that the notion is contradictory to the Word of God,—to the reason and senses of man,—and to the belief of the ancient Fathers of the Church. The *third* part explains the meaning of the assertion, that Christ is present in the

[1] This Treatise is now printed in Cranmer's Remains, vol. ii. p. 283—463.

[2] How different from this was Ridley's own estimate of Cranmer's powers and attainments, appears from his conference in the Tower, written by himself, but published by Foxe. "They would have given me," he says, "the glory of the writing that book, which was yet said of some of them to contain the most heinous heresy that ever was." He replied to this insinuation, by saying, "The book was made by a great and learned man, one who was able to do the like again." And as for himself, he "assured them that he was never able to do or write any such thing; and that the writer passed him no less than the learned master his young scholar." That Ridley here alluded to the *Defence*, and subsequent controversy with Gardiner, see Laur. Bampt. Lect. note (11) to Serm. I. p. 214. Ed. 1820.

Holy Supper; and its object is to show that, "as our regeneration in Christ, by Baptism, is *spiritual*, even so our eating and drinking is a *spiritual* feeding; which kind of regeneration and feeding requireth no real and *corporeal* presence of Christ, but only his presence in spirit, grace, and effectual operation[1]." It is worthy of remark that, in this part of his exposition, he has resorted to an illustration similar to that employed by Luther, in support of *his* peculiar Sacramental Doctrine. The German Reformer had, with signal infelicity, compared the union of the two distinct substances in the Eucharist to the combination of fire and metal in red-hot iron. I know not whether the English Divine thought this illustration too good to be lost; but be this as it may, he has actually applied it to his own purpose, in the following manner:—"As hot and burning iron is iron still, and yet hath the force of fire,—and, as the flesh of Christ, still remaining flesh, giveth life, as the flesh of him that is God;—even so, the Sacramental bread and wine still remain in their proper kinds, and yet, to those who worthily eat and drink them, they are turned, not into the corporeal presence, but into the *virtue* of Christ's flesh and blood." The image, it must be allowed, is, if any thing, rather more serviceable to the cause of Cranmer, than to that of Luther; fire being a much less apt representative of bodily substance, than it is of a hidden *virtue* supposed to pervade, or at least to attend, the conse-

[1] Cranmer's Remains, vol. ii. p. 404.

crated elements. It is, however, almost entirely useless for either purpose[1]. Instead of shedding light upon the subject, it only tends to darken it, as by veil of suspicious mysticism[2]. The *fourth* part of

[1] Cranmer's Remains, p. 419.—The similitude gave Cranmer more trouble that it was worth. Gardiner, as might have been expected, got hold of it, and perverted it. "By this similitude," he says, "bread may conceive *virtue*, as iron conceiveth fire: and then, as we call iron burning and fiery, so we may call bread holy and *virtuous!*" This strange equivocation drives the Archbishop into a long explanatory paragraph; in which he declares,—what Gardiner surely must have perceived,—that he used "virtue," not to signify moral quality, but power or efficacy,—as when we say that "there is *virtue* in herbs, or in stones, or in words, &c." And he adds, "my only purpose was to teach, that iron, remaining in its proper nature and substance, by conceiving fire, may work another thing than is the nature of iron. And so, likewise, bread remaining in its proper nature and substance, in the ministration of the Sacrament, hath another use than to feed the body." Cranmer's Answer to Gardiner; Works, vol. iii. pp. 279—283, 284. Any one who looks into this controversy, will see that it might have been carried on, in this manner, to the present day, without any perceptible approach to a termination, if Gardiner could have lived so long; or if Gardiner's mantle could have been dropped, successively, on the Romish combatants, for the time being!

[2] It is not impossible that the use of this Lutheran illustration may have *helped* to give currency and effect to the notion of his having once decidedly held the Lutheran doctrine of the Sacrament. Gardiner intimates it to be his belief, that the materials of the second book of the "Defence" were compiled when Cranmer was a Lutheran, and with a view to the support of Luther's opinion. Cranmer's Remains, vol. iii. p. 430. And it must be confessed, that the Archbishop's denial is not particularly vigorous. He merely says, in reply, "you have no probation of your thought." Ibid. p. 440.

the book is directed against the notion, that the wicked are capable of participation in the "virtue and benefit of Christ's body and blood;"—and it further maintains, that it is no less than rank idolatry to worship the Deity under the visible symbol of bread and wine. The *fifth* and last part exposes the grand perversion of all, —the Romish sacrifice of the Mass. It affirms, that the word sacrifice is, in strict propriety, applicable only to the immolation of Christ on the Cross, and to the Mosaic offerings by which it was prefigured, and which may, therefore, be *virtually* identified with it: and that whenever the Mass, or the Supper of the Lord, is termed a sacrifice *offered by the Church*, it is so designated merely by a sort of figurative use of the phrase,—applicable, in common, to all the spiritual services of Christian men.

Great success of Cranmer's "Defence," &c.

From this brief outline it will, at once, be collected that the object of the Archbishop was, first, to provide his readers with a true and genuine exposition of the Eucharist; and then to arm them against the four cardinal errors with which that holy Sacrament had been disfigured by the Papists: 1. Transubstantiation; 2. The corporeal and local Presence; 3. The eating and drinking of Christ's Body and Blood by the wicked; and, 4. The propitiatory sacrifice of the Mass. The appearance of this work effectually put an end to the doubts and conjectures which had for some time been floating about, respecting the views of the Archbishop on the Sacramental question. The ability and learning with which his task was achieved, are sufficiently

attested by its extraordinary success. No less than three impressions of it were demanded in the very year of its publication (1550): and Cranmer himself afterwards declared[1], that it had been so instrumental in the diffusion and establishment of sound opinions, as to impress him with the profoundest sense of the invincible force of truth. But the alarms of the Romanists formed a testimony to its merit, of all others the most conclusive, and the most honourable. So formidable an attack upon the very citadel of their strength, provoked to furious jealousy the spirit of Roman Catholic Orthodoxy. The Papal party felt that their cause was lost, unless the assault should be instantly and vigorously repelled[2]: and two champions immediately stepped forth to do battle with the Apostate. One of them was that Proteus of Divinity, Dr. Smythe, then residing at Louvain[3]. The other was Steven Gardiner, who at the same time was under

Answered by Gardiner and Smythe.

[1] In his Dedication of the Latin Edition to Edw. VI. in 1553.

[2] Ibid.

[3] This worthless man had shifted his religious profession so often, and so shamelessly, that an opponent, with whom he desired to confer, replied that he would neither talk with him, or believe him, unless it could be known whether he had finally done recanting. He renounced the Mass in 1547, at St. Paul's Cross, and vowed to abide in the pure doctrine of the Gospel, *though it should cost him his life;* but nevertheless continued to patronize the ancient errors. He afterwards affronted the Archbishop by his insolent opposition to the marriage of the Clergy,—endangered the life of Peter Martyr, by his turbulent demeanour at Oxford, on the agitation of the Sacramental ques-

arbitrary confinement in the Tower; and who was evidently impatient, if not for the crown of Martyrdom, at least for the honour and dignity of a Confessor. We have already seen that he openly produced his performance before the Council, in order to confirm the public in the persuasion, that he suffered purely for his undaunted faithfulness in the cause of the *Catholic* verity.

The contest in which Gardiner was now engaged was by no means eminently suitable to his peculiar habits and attainments. He was, indeed, gifted by nature with singular shrewdness and penetration. He was at once a bold and crafty politician. He was eminently dexterous and active in diplomacy. He was a patron of letters, and himself no ordinary

tion there,—and printed a book against him *de Votis Monasticis;* in which he professed himself *ready to die in the quarrel of the Papal religion;* a sure sign, as Strype observes, that he meant to die for neither. After his flight, he sent an abject letter to Cranmer, soliciting his good offices with the King,—offered to write in vindication of the marriage of Priests,—and added, that if he remained in exile, he should be *compelled* to write against the Archbishop's Book on the Sacrament, and the whole of King Edward's proceedings. This application being disregarded, he *did* write against the Archbishop, and moreover equipped Gardiner with authorities for the same purpose. In the reign of Mary, he openly returned to Romanism. On the accession of Elizabeth he was imprisoned, and then addressed Archbishop Parker in the same strain of hypocrisy and cowardice which he tried upon Cranmer, and, it would seem, with better success; for he was liberated, and finally left England. Such was the "*profligate conscience*" of Gardiner's auxiliary polemic! See Strype's Eccl. Mem. vol. ii. c. 6, and Todd's Cranm. vol. ii. pp. 172, 173.

scholar. He was profoundly conversant with the Canon Law, which, as Cranmer observes, "purposely corrupteth the truth of God's word[1]." His character, in short, was that of a keen, worldly-minded, ambitious Churchman. His knowledge of theology, however, was scarcely respectable. With the writings of the ancient Fathers he was but scantily acquainted; his familiarity with the Schoolmen was probably not profound; and in the art of solid reasoning he was immeasurably inferior to his antagonist. His deficiency in learning, was in a great measure supplied by Dr. Smythe, who furnished him with a mass of authorities which he would in vain have attempted to collect for himself[2]. And he trusted to his own acuteness and address for the effective employment of the materials thus provided to his hand.

Cranmer's Reply to Gardiner.

The Primate lost no time in preparing a reply to the Bishop of Winchester's confutation. His answer was eagerly expected by the public, and made its appearance in Oct. 1551, with a title of inordinate length, according to the fashion of those times. His method exhibited a perfect model of controversial fairness, and manifested an unbounded confidence in the strength of his own course. It presented to the reader, first, the main positions of his own original treatise,—then the reply of Gardiner to each,—and lastly, his own refutation of this reply, almost article by article: so that the whole of his

[1] See Cranmer's Answer, &c. Remains, vol. iii. p. 77.
[2] Ibid. p. 253.

adversary's work was, in fact, incorporated with his own. To the book of his inconstant antagonist, Dr. Smythe, he did not condescend to frame any distinct answer. The animadversions of that writer were incidentally disposed of in the body of the work, whenever they were such as appeared to be worthy of notice. A reply to the preface of Smythe was, however, subjoined at the end of the volume, chiefly for the purpose of demolishing his falsehoods and calumnies. In this supplement, the Archbishop protests that the whole of Smythe's performance is too full of "boasting, slandering, misreporting, wrangling, wresting, false construing, and lying," to merit any separate discussion. And he adds, that in those places where he and his confederate disagree, he shall "set them together, to try which of them is more stout and valiant to overthrow the other[1]."

Gardiner's rejoinder.

The controversy, however, did not end with the Archbishop's answer. The Bishop of Winchester was ready with a rejoinder in 1552. It was written in Latin, and published under the feigned name of Marcus Antonius Constantius; and in 1554, it appeared again, with the author's real name, and with a title[2] which bespoke the triumphant position of the writer, who then was the Lord High Chancellor of the Popish Queen. It is impossible to

[1] Cranmer's Remains, vol. iii. p. 23.

[2] "Confutatio cavillationum quibus Sacrosanctum Eucharistiæ Sacramentum ab impiis Capharnaïtis impedi solet. Authore Stephano Winton. Episcopo, Angliæ Cancellario. 8vo" Lovanii, 1554.

divine when the contest would have terminated, had Cranmer and his enemy lived to carry it on. When the Archbishop was imprisoned, the chief occupation of his solitary hours appears to have been the completion of another work, in vindication of his foregoing labours. It was Cranmer's intention, so far to follow the example of his adversary, as to compose this new treatise in Latin. Three parts of it were actually completed, when the design was interrupted by his approaching martyrdom: but not a fragment of the work is known to be extant at the present day. The controversy was afterwards followed up by Peter Martyr, in a volume which was published in 1559, entitled "The Ancient and Apostolic Doctrine of the Holy Sacrament of the Eucharist;" in which, as the writer confidently declares to Calvin, the artifices of Gardiner, were unravelled and demolished. But Gardiner was not then living to call the boast in question.

Fortunately, however, for the reputation of the Archbishop, he did not confine *himself* to any such lingering measures of defence. The artifices of his antagonist compelled him to make more immediate provision for his own vindication, in the eyes of the learned world. The Bishop of Winchester, in his Latin work, entitled *Constantius*, had resorted to a process of such garbling and mutilation, that it was impossible for the reader to form any adequate conception of the merits of the book which the censor had professed to analyze. By this stratagem Cranmer was exposed to a most iniquitous disadvantage.

His own part of the controversy had hitherto been carried on in English; whereas the rejoinder of Gardiner was composed in the language of the learned. The divines of the Continent were thus reduced to the necessity of receiving their impressions respecting the controversy, from the perverted statements of one of the parties to it. In order, therefore, that the lettered foreigners might be able to form an impartial judgment, the Archbishop was anxious that his first Book on the Sacrament should be immediately translated into Latin: and this good office was admirably performed for him by Sir John Clarke. The translation was published early in 1553, with some additions; and a Latin letter was prefixed to it, addressed to King Edward, in which, after a short account of the dispute, the Archbishop complains that his arguments were dealt with by *Constantius* in such a manner as might best suit his own purposes; that they were so inverted and torn asunder—so mutilated and disfigured,—that they could no more be recognised than the mangled and scattered limbs of Medea's murdered children; and that, for this reason, he had thought it expedient that they should now be translated into Latin, and thus presented to the learned Divines of all nations, in their original form and integrity. It was, further, his intention to have his reply to Gardiner's first attack turned into Latin also; but he was not spared to see this project executed. The work was, however, eventually undertaken by Sir J. Cheke and John Foxe, while

they were in exile, and was completed by the latter, in 1557: but the publication was prevented, partly, by the apprehension that the world might grow weary of the contest; and partly by the death of Mary, and the occupation of the exiles in other and more hopeful pursuits[1].

A critical account of this controversy would far exceed the limits of this work. Little more than an historical notice of it can be attempted. I will pause, therefore, only to express my astonishment at the doubts which some of Cranmer's Papal contemporaries most hardily and stupidly affected to entertain, respecting his qualifications for a theological contest[2]. The testimony of Peter Martyr—

[1] A full account of this controversy is given in Strype, (Cranmer, b. ii. c. 25) who says that he was in possession of Foxe's Manuscript, which bore this title—"De totâ Sacramenti Eucharistiæ Causâ, Institutionum Libri V., Autore D. THOMA CRANMERO, Archiepiscopo Cantuariensi. Quibus et Stephani Garneri Wintoniensis, et Smythi Doctoris Theologi, impugnationibus respondetur."

[2] Gardiner had the temerity to charge him with ignorance; and this, while he and his confederates were staggering beneath the weight of the Archbishop's consummate knowledge.—See Cranmer's Works, vol. iii. p. 465. Cranmer notices this silly imputation (which, he says, was "privately and openly circulated by Gardiner and all the rout of the Papists,") with the contempt it deserves.—Ibid. p. 478. In another place, too, he declares, with honest confidence, that, while his antagonist must needs trust his men, (without whom he could do very little, being bred to other kinds of study,) he, the Archbishop, "had exercised himself in the study of Scripture and Divinity from his youth;" and that his habit was to "examine, judge,

the voice of all his Protestant contemporaries—his own copious and elaborate collections, still extant in our National Libraries—sufficiently testify that his rèsearch was indefatigable, and his learning sound and ripe. Nothing but ample leisure, and freedom from the distractions incident to the first Ecclesiastical office in the kingdom, were wanting to place him among the very foremost of European Divines. It implies no disparagement to his powers or his attainments to say that his defence of the genuine Sacramental doctrine was, in part, a compilation from the labours of other men. No wise man, whatever might be his own acquisitions, would ever dream of abstaining from the use of materials already collected, in the discussion of a question of such vast importance and extent, and (thanks to the rhetoric of the Fathers, and the metaphysics of the Schoolmen,) of such bewildering intricacy. But then, none except a truly learned man could safely or confidently venture on the application of such materials. Of this we have a notable and very curious instance in the course of this debate. Among the most powerful testimonies *alleged* in behalf of the doctrine that the bread was changed into the very Body of Christ, was that of *Theophilus Alexandrinus!* And this testimony had most probably been produced by Gardiner in a former treatise, published by him in 1546; for he

and write all such weighty matters for himself; although he was neither so arrogant or wilful as to refuse the good counsel or admonition of any one, be he man or master, friend or foe."—Ibid. p. 338.

seems to take it upon himself in his answer to Cranmer[1]. But how stood the fact? The passage in question had been quoted by some previous writer: and the reference to it, not containing the name written at length, led Gardiner to imagine that *Theophilus* was the authority in question; whereas, in truth, the real author of the passage was *Theophylact!* Now Theophilus was Bishop of Alexandria, A.D. 385. Theophylact was Archbishop of Bulgaria, A.D. 1077. And every one must perceive how worthless, upon a question of this description, would be a testimony of the 11th century, compared with a testimony of the 4th century. The ignorance, or the dishonesty, which falsely appropriated the more valuable evidence to the Romish cause, called down from Cranmer a very just rebuke, which a more practised and accomplished Divine would never have incurred[2]. Of the labours of the Archbishop throughout this conflict, it is sufficient to say that they commanded the admiration of Protestants, and the alarm and hatred of Romanists, beyond any other writings of the age[3]. Of the dangerous eminence to which this controversy helped to raise the Archbishop, we have a sufficient proof in the sequel of his life.

[1] See Cranmer's Remains, vol. iii. p. 292.

[2] Ibid. vol. ii. p. 417 ; vol. iii. p. 295—297; vol. iv. p. 436, where the quotation from Theophylact will be found.

[3] See the testimonies of Latimer, John Knox, Clarke, Foxe, Matthew Parker, &c. &c. in the Editor's Preface to the Oxford Edition of Cranmer's Remains, p. xcix. note (m) (n).

In September, 1550, the Archbishop held a visitation of the Dean and Chapter of Canterbury. This body, it will be remembered, had been remodelled by him in 1540, and restored from the condition of a priory, to that of a collegiate church. His inquiries on this occasion present us with nothing very remarkable. But they are worthy of notice, as manifesting his incessant anxiety for the abolition of superstitious practice, the suppression of strife, and the promotion of sound learning, and genuine piety. The injunctions issued by him to the Chapter, at the end of October, in the same year, are brief and simple; and indicate that there was nothing in the discipline of the Church which called for serious animadversion. The Society appears to have been in a peaceable and orderly state, which exhibited a gratifying contrast with the scene of dissension which it had presented to him, at his diocesan visitation of 1543[1].

Visitation of the Dean and Chapter of Canterbury.

The degradation of Gardiner was followed, at no very long interval, by that of Bishop Tonstal, a Prelate eminent for his extensive learning, and his exemplary moderation. Like many other of the Roman Catholic Bishops, he had concurred in the substitution of the Royal for the Papal Supremacy, and in the suppres-

1551. Deprivation of Tonstal.

[1] See Ante, vol. i. c. ix. p. 245—247.—One of the Archbishop's injunctions may, perhaps, occasion a smile at this day: viz. "10. That all back doors into the city out of any Prebendary's house, or other's, shall be clearly shut up."—Cranmer's Remains, vol. ii. p. 196—201.

sion of the grosser corruptions of the Romish Church. It seems hitherto to have been his principle, that obedience to *the powers that be* is the first of social duties ; and that private opinions should always be sacrificed to the preservation of the public peace; and he had testified his steadiness in this persuasion by a scrupulous conformity with every Ecclesiastical change, when once it had been established by law. It was, nevertheless, tolerably evident, that he secretly deplored the sweeping progress of the religious Reformation; and in the course of the present year, he gave utterance to his sentiments in a treatise on the endless question of the Eucharist. Although he was then in the seventy-seventh year of his age, he was unable to hold his peace, when he found that the doctrine of Transubstantiation, and the sacrifice of the Mass, were passing through the furnace of such a fiery trial; and in the course of his work, the vehemence of his zeal occasioned some disturbance of his usual serenity. His polemical theology, however, exposed him to no molestation. The offence which brought him into trouble, was one that bordered closely upon high treason. In the year 1550, one Vivian Menvile addressed a letter to Tonstal, relative to a scheme of insurrection then in agitation in the North of England. This communication, in a luckless hour, Tonstal was imprudent enough to conceal, and what was worse, to answer; and thus to prepare against himself a two-edged weapon of accusation. The conduct of Menvile would almost seem to indicate, that he was employed to seduce the

Bishop into some treasonable act[1]; for he afterwards turned his accuser, and produced his letter before the Council. This happened previously to the death of Somerset, who, in his anxiety for the preservation of the aged Prelate, secreted the letter in question. After the execution of Somerset, the papers of that statesman were ransacked, and then the fatal document was discovered. The Bishop on this was committed to the Tower[2]; and, in order to deprive him of his bishopric, a Bill of attainder was brought against him, in the House of Lords, for misprision of treason. Archbishop Cranmer intrepidly opposed this most arbitrary measure, in defiance of the Duke of Northumberland; whose impatience for the ruin of Tonstal was sharpened by the hope of transferring to himself the revenues, jurisdiction, and dignity, of the county palatine of Durham. All opposition, however, was useless. The Bill travelled to its completion, with scarcely a word of contradiction from any one Popish Lord or Bishop. Nothing, therefore, was left for the Primate, but to record his dissent on the Journals of the House; and he was joined in this protest only by a single Peer, Lord Stourton,

20th Dec. 1551.

Cranmer protests against it.

[1] There is, indeed, no direct evidence to support this suspicion. But the well known anxiety of Northumberland to appropriate the honours and emoluments of the See of Durham, render it highly probable. He was a man of whom almost any enormity is credible.

[2] King Edward's Journal, 20th Dec. 1551.

who was a zealous Roman Catholic[1]. From that hour, the Duke of Northumberland became a determined enemy to Cranmer.

But if the House of Lords was overawed by the ambitious Protector, the Commons, to their eternal honour, were far less tractable. The only evidence sent down to them consisted of certain depositions in writing. Now, by an Act recently passed[2], it was provided, that no person should be arraigned, condemned, or attainted, on any charge of treason, but on the oath of two lawful witnesses, to be confronted with the party accused. In the spirit of this noble law, the Commons resolved that, before they could proceed with the Bill, the Bishop must be personally confronted with his accusers; and the measure was consequently lost. Commissioners, however, were found to execute what the Parliament refused; and by them Tonstal was deprived of his See, before the termination of 1552[3].

In this transaction, the integrity and courage of the Primate were most honourably displayed. The same spirit which kept him at his post, in spite of the injunctions of the imperious Henry, when the Act of the Six Articles was under discussion, now armed him against the overbearing violence of the Pro-

[1] On the 31st of March the Bill was read a third time, and "communi omnium assensu conclusa est, Dissentientibus Archiepiscopo Cantuariensi, et Domino Sturton."—Lords' Journals.

[2] 5 and 6 Edw. VI. c. xi. s. 12.

[3] Burnet, vol. ii. p. 124. Strype's Cranmer, b. ii. c. 32.

tector. He had always esteemed and admired the character of Tonstal, notwithstanding the wide diversity of their opinions on religious and Ecclesiastical questions ; and he now stood almost alone in virtuous opposition to the measures concerted for the ruin of that estimable Prelate.

It was a fortunate circumstance, that the selfish intrigues and projects of the Court were not sufficient to counteract the influence of the Primate in the promotion of able and worthy men to the Episcopal Bench. He had this year the satisfaction to promote his modest friend, Miles Coverdale [1], to the See of Exeter, on the resignation of Bishop Veysey ; a fit reward for the services of one, whose labours in the translation of the Scriptures had placed him among the most eminent of benefactors to his country. It is likewise certain, that old Hugh Latimer might, if he had been so disposed, have resumed the mitre, which he had cast away when the Six Articles converted it, in his estimation, into a crown of thorns. But the aged and simple-minded man preferred the unambitious retirement, which he found in the Primate's hospitable palace, to the care and distraction from which he had long escaped ; and there he was content to remain, the friend and advocate of them that were " desolate and oppressed ;" the ever ready solicitor, to whom they that cried out against the " law's delay," and the " insolence of office," were perpetually crowding, with their petitions and com-

[1] Strype, Cranmer, b. ii. c. 26.

plaints; the almoner, who distributed the bounty of his host to the indigent and the afflicted. Every one must be familiar with the description given by him, in one of his sermons to the Court, of the function which he now chose, in preference to the anxious dignity of the purple. "I walk now and then," he says, "in my Lord of Canterbury's garden, *looking* in my book, as I can *do* little at it, though something I needs must do, to satisfy this place. No sooner am I there, and have read awhile, than there cometh a knocking at the gate, and anon cometh my man, and tells me, that some one is there who would speak with me. And then I find, that the suitor is one who desires that I will speak for him, that his matter may be heard; for that he hath long lain at a heavy cost, without being able to bring his cause to a hearing." It is not wonderful that a man like this, though still without a See, should retain among those who addressed him, the title of "Lord," and all the honour and veneration due to a Father in God. The humility and benevolence of the man himself, and the kindness which provided him with an honourable asylum, form, together, one of the most touching and interesting pictures of the time.

Neither the controversy with Gardiner, nor the arduous avocations of his office, were sufficient to exhaust the patient vigilance of the Archbishop, in behalf of the great cause committed by Providence to his care. In the course of the preceding year his attention had been called to a work of no ordinary importance,—the revisal of the Common Prayer, or Service-Book of 1548.

The hostility of the Roman Catholics to that compilation was, of course, unabated. They had never ceased, for several years, to stigmatize the Reformed faith as a State Religion,—just as if it had been forged and framed wholly by Secular men, instead of being the work of Ecclesiastics, adopted by the representatives of the whole community[1]. But a clamour was now raised against the Prayer-Book from an opposite quarter, which demanded much more serious consideration. There was at this time in England a religious party, who had imported from the continent more rigorous and sweeping principles of innovation than had been adopted by the master builders of our own Protestant Church. The reformed communities abroad had, most of them, been deprived, by adverse circumstances, of the Episcopal succession. By this loss, they were almost compelled to raise up the fabric of their Ecclesiastical Polity upon foundations widely different from those which were laid in the earliest times: and the consequence was, that, at last, primitive antiquity, by degrees, was virtually expunged from their annals of the Christian Church. In search of the *origines* of their whole system, they were tempted to spring back over the gulf of ages, and lighted at once upon the ground which had been consecrated by the personal presence of the Saviour and his Apostles: and there alone they professed to seek for authority, not only in support of fundamental doctrines, but of all institutions relating to worship,

[1] Strype, Eccl. Mem. vol. ii. c. 11.

discipline, and government. With persons of this description, the name of Calvin was already beginning to be a point of union;—and Calvin, some time after the appearance of the Service Book, had very intelligibly intimated that the English Formularies were strongly tainted with a savour of Romanism [1]. The debates of the English Convocation, in 1550, appear to have been partially influenced by these misgivings;

[1] In October, 1548, Calvin addressed a letter, of unusual length, to the Protector, in which, among various other matters, he complains of the superstitions still adhering to the English Communion office; but this was before the first Service Book came out. He, afterwards, sent a letter to Cranmer, deploring the confused state of religion in England. "Confused I call it," he says, "because outward superstitions have been so imperfectly corrected, that innumerable slips are still left, and are perpetually shooting up. I hear, indeed, that such a heap of Papal corruptions have been spared, *as must nearly overwhelm the pure and genuine worship of God.*" This letter is printed among those of 1551. But it is evidently an answer to a letter of Cranmer, dated March, 1552. (Cranmer's Remains, vol. i. p. 346.) At all events, it most probably refers to the Liturgy of 1548; for the amended one did not appear till *late* in 1552. The new Liturgy did not please him much better than the first: for in 1555, he writes to the English at Frankfort, that the English Service Book (then abolished by Mary) had contained many fooleries that might be endured,—*(multas tolerabiles ineptias)*,—that its purity was very far from what could be desired, though its defects might be borne for a time,—and that, if sincere religion had hitherto flourished in England, there would have been much corrected, and much removed. Calv. Epist. pp. 39—43. 61, 62. 98. Op. tom. ix. Ed. Amst. 1667. It deserves to be noted, that in his letter to Cranmer, he speaks indignantly of the pillage of the Church, which he calls an intolerable mischief. Ibid. p. 62.

and it was even understood, that King Edward himself had declared that, if the Bishops should decline the task of purifying the Common Prayer from its manifold blemishes, he would take the matter into his own hands, and recommend it to the attention of Parliament at their very next session.

Revisal of the Common Prayer.

Whatever might be his veneration for the name of Calvin, nothing was further from the Archbishop's mind than the thought of bowing down before the supremacy of Geneva. He was, however, quite ready to receive any reasonable suggestions which might be offered for the improvement of the devotional Formularies; and most assuredly he never imagined that the "*aid of the Holy Spirit*" had been vouchsafed in such measure to the original labourers in the work, as to supersede all possible necessity for future correction. He proceeded, however, in this matter with his usual circumspection. One of his first steps was to consult Peter Martyr, and Martin Bucer, the great theological authorities of Oxford and Cambridge. With this view, he had procured a translation of the book into Latin, executed by Alexander Aless, chiefly for the accommodation of Bucer, who was but little acquainted with the English language. He then told them, that he was desirous of their frank opinion relative to the alterations that might be expedient; adding, that the Convocation had already resolved that certain changes should be effected. But, wishing to be in possession of their unbiassed judgment, and having no intention to raise them to the dignity of

arbitrators,—he cautiously abstained from specifying to them any one of the corrections which that Body had in contemplation. This application drew from Martin Bucer a copious list of animadversions; the whole of which were sanctioned by the concurrence of Peter Martyr. The review of the book was then completed by the Archbishop himself, assisted principally by Ridley and Cox. The suggestions of the two foreign divines were, in some instances, adopted, and, in others, rejected; and the result of all these labours was the Book of Common Prayer, reduced very nearly to the precise form in which it appears at the present day.

It would lengthen this work too much, to specify all the particulars in which the amended Liturgy differed from that of 1548[1]. The chief additions were, first, the introduction of the opening sentences, the Exhortation, the General Confession and Absolution before the Lord's Prayer, in the Morning and Evening Services,—improvements, of which the hint was taken, not from the original Liturgy of Calvin, but from the Translation of it by Valerandus Pollanus, Calvin's successor at Strasburgh[2]: secondly, the insertion of the Ten Commandments in the office for the Communion: thirdly, an alteration in the

[1] The particulars of this Revisal may be found in Burnet, vol. ii. pp. 155. 169. 189.—Coll. vol. ii. 309, 310.—Strype, Cranm. b. ii. c. 16 and 33.—Eccl. Mem. vol. ii. c. 26.—Todd's Cranm. vol. ii. pp. 267—278.—Soames, Hist. Ref. vol. iii. pp. 592—607.

[2] For an account of the Strasburgh Liturgy, see Strype, Eccl. Mem. vol. ii. c. 29.

form of administering the Elements, which, in the first Service Book, was such as seemed to ascribe to the *bread* the preservation of the *body* of the communicant, and to the *wine*, the preservation of his *soul*: and, lastly, an explanatory rubric, to instruct the people, that kneeling at the altar was merely a posture expressive of humility and devotion, and indicated nothing like an adoration of the Elements. There was, likewise, a most important omission in the Baptismal Service, amounting to a virtual negation of those narrow views of Redemption, which then were beginning to pour gall into the sincere milk of the Gospel. In the original Formulary, the prayer, that the child to be baptised may be received into the ark of Christ's Church, contained the words—"*and so be saved from perishing*." This passage was now rejected; doubtless, because it seemed to imply a presumptuous and uncharitable limitation of the mercies of God. The other changes consisted in the removal of certain usages and ceremonies, which were thought to bear a frivolous or superstitious aspect; and in the reduction of the whole Ritual to a form of more simple and primitive solemnity. The extreme care and deliberation with which these changes were introduced, will appear from the facts, that they were first agitated in 1550,—that the Act of Parliament which authorized the book was not passed till the spring of 1552,—that the first of the following November was fixed as the earliest day on which it was to be brought into use,—and that, almost up to the latest moment, fresh corrections and improvements

were introduced into it, in order that it might go forth as free as possible from all exception. On the day appointed, it was read in his Cathedral by Ridley; habited, conformably to the new Rubric, in his rochet only, without the embroidered cope, or vestment. In the afternoon, a Sermon was preached by him at St. Paul's Cross, chiefly on the new Service Book; and his discourse was of such formidable length, that the Corporation of London, who attended it, departed homewards, at nearly five o'clock, by torch-light[1].

The revision of the Common Prayer was a signal to the Papists, for a triumphant outcry against what they had been pleased to call a religion by Act of Parliament. They exclaimed, that what was called the *Reformation*, was nothing better than an endless series of *transformations*; that they who had undertaken the spiritual guidance of the people had no fixed standard before their eyes; that no sooner was one form of faith or worship set up, than it was thrown down again by the next King, or the next Parliament, and another substituted in its place; and that all this uncertainty was the inevitable consequence of their defection from the Head of the Church, the centre of Christian unity[2]. This has, at all times, been a favourite topic of invective with the adherents of Rome; but every intelligent Protestant must know, that the answer to it is extremely simple. If the self-styled *Catholic* Church will not reform her

[1] Strype, Cranm. b. ii. c. 33.

[2] See Strype, Eccl. Mem. vol. ii. c. 11 and 26.

own manifold corruptions, nothing is left for particular branches of it but to undertake the Reformation for themselves; and nothing short of a stupendous effusion of the Holy Spirit can make such Reformation the work of a moment. The perversions which centuries of barbarism and superstition had heaped upon the Gospel, must, in the natural course of things, be gradually and successively lifted off; and, surely, there is no grievous presumption in the hope, that God will be favourable to the labours of righteous men, at every step of their progress towards the recovery of his truth.

The next, and perhaps the greatest monument of the Archbishop's learning, industry, and prudence, was the preparation of those Articles which, with certain subsequent retrenchments and modifications, form, to this day, the Church of England's Confession of Faith. This project was, in truth, no more than the main branch of a design, far more comprehensive, on which he had been long intent, and to which he had been anxious to devote all his attainments and capacities. Ever since his advancement to the Primacy, he had carried on an extensive correspondence with the Reformers of Germany;—so extensive, indeed, that he had, on his establishment at Canterbury, an agent whose sole business it was to conduct these communications[1]. This perpetual interchange

[1] Stryp. Cranm. b. ii. c. 31. It has been stated before, that the Archbishop was once brought into jeopardy by his well-known and active correspondence with the *heretics* of Germany.—Ante, vol. i. c. 9, p. 249.

of sentiments led, naturally enough, to a more distinct and painful view of the danger and the infamy brought upon the cause of the Reformation by the discussions prevalent among the Protestant body.

Project for an Agreement in Religious Doctrine among Protestants.

The most promising remedy for these mischiefs would, of course, be a union among the Protestant Churches; and, if possible, a Confession of Faith so framed, that all might adopt it as one common symbol. The original project of such a coalition is, undoubtedly, to be ascribed to the pacific and *truly* Catholic genius of Philip Malancthon. In 1539 he repeated to Henry VIII. a wish, which he had frequently expressed before, that an agreement in religious doctrines should be established in all the Churches, which condemn the tyranny and impiety of the Roman Bishop[1]. And in 1542, he states it to be his desire that there should be a convocation of learned men, who, after conference on all debated points, might leave to posterity a solid and perspicuous doctrine[2]. The accession of Edward VI. encouraged the hope

[1] "Opto, ut antea sæpe scripsi, consensum piæ doctrinæ constitui in Ecclesiis omnibus, quæ Romani Episcopi tyrannidem damnant." Strype, Ecc. Mem. vol. i. App. No. 101. The letter from which this is taken is dated 26th March, 1539.

[2] "Quod *sæpe* optavi,—ut aliquando, authoritati seu Regum, seu aliorum piorum Principum, convocati viri docti de controversiis omnibus liberè colloquerentur, et relinquerent posteris firmam et perspicuam doctrinam,—idem nunc opto." This was written in 1542. See the Correspondence of Melancthon, quoted in Arch. Laur. Bampt. Lect. pp. 227—231. Ed. 1820.

that such a scheme might be practicable: and all those worthies who were most distinguished for moderation, were impatient for such an establishment of religion, under the patronage of Edward, as their Defender[1]. The Archbishop laboured at this project, almost without ceasing, from 1548[2] to 1552: and nothing could exceed his anxiety for the presence of its author, Philip Melancthon, in England. Melancthon was of a temper eminently congenial with his own. He was a pattern of gentleness and moderation. He was second to none but Luther in the general estimation of Protestants; and by some was even deemed superior to Luther. Of the high value entertained for him in England, no better evidence can be desired, than the repeated and urgent invitations which he had received to honour our country with his presence. The earliest of these was in 1534. In 1535 it was repeated: and, probably, nothing but the death of Anne Boleyn defeated the intention. Again, in 1538, he received such flattering solicitations from Henry VIII., that Steven Gardiner himself, (who often faithfully reflected the light of the Royal countenance,) professed the highest regard for the German Reformer. On the accession of Edward these invitations were reiterated with better hope. In 1549 the Archbishop besought him, in the most urgent language, to join the band of learned and illus-

[1] Strype, Cranm. b. ii. c. 15. and b. iii. c. 23, 24, 25.

[2] See a Letter of Cranmer on this subject to Albert Hardenberg, dated July, 1548. Cranmer's Remains, vol. i. p. 331.

trious foreigners who then had resorted to England, and there to aid, with his counsels and exertions, the grand design of a religious union, for which the Archbishop was labouring with all his faculties [1]. And, lastly, when the Chair of Theology was vacated, early in 1551, by the death of Bucer, it was apparently kept open for Melancthon; probably in the hope that an honourable and independent provision might better reconcile him to the abandonment of his own country. After all, however, Melancthon never could be prevailed upon to visit England: and the Archbishop was left to prosecute the undertaking with such assistance as he was able to procure.

At one time, this enterprise wore so formidable an

[1] His words are,—"Many learned and pious men, partly from Italy, partly from Germany, have repaired to us, and more are daily expected; which *choir* of the Church if you will adorn and dignify with your presence, I know not how you can more illustrate the glory of God. I know that you have often wished that pious and wise men would join in deliberation, and, with the weight of their authority, collect the materials for a comprehensive form of Ecclesiastical Doctrine, which might be delivered incorrupt to posterity. *This is now my great object.* I therefore intreat that you will aid us with your presence and your counsel; and that you will not so fortify your mind against my importunity, as to appear wanting to your own vows, and opposed to the manifest calling of God." The whole of this letter has recently been printed, in the original Latin, from a MS. at Zurich, in Cranmer's Remains, vol. i. p. 337. Lett. 176. It is dated Feb. 10, 1549.

The reader will find an ample verification of all that is stated in the text, relative to Melancthon, in the very learned notes to Abp. Laurence's Bampton Lecture.

aspect in the sight of the Romanists, that they began to tremble lest the heretics should, actually, combine themselves into one body, and receive, not only the doctrine, but the discipline of the Anglican Church [1]. It is further quite clear that it was not till the year 1552 that the Archbishop felt himself compelled finally to abandon the design. Two letters of his are still extant, dated March, 1552, one addressed to Bullinger [2], and the other to Calvin [3], in each of which, he still contends that, as the Papists were assembled at Trent, so the Protestants should hold a synod of their most learned and excellent men, for the settlement of Doctrine, and more especially with a view to agreement on the Sacramental controversy,—and that this Synod should be held in England, or elsewhere if more convenient. In his answer to Cranmer's proposal, Calvin professes the most ardent anxiety for the completion of such a work, and protests that he would cross ten seas to be instrumental to it, if he saw any prospect of being useful. But he dwells very much on the manifold difficulties of the project, and the impediments which disabled him from personal co-operation [4]. The last effort of

[1] Strype's Cranmer, b. ii. c. 15.

[2] This letter has lately been printed from a manuscript at Zurich, in Cranmer's Remains, vol. i. p. 344. Letter 283.

[3] Cranmer's Remains, vol. i. p. 346. Letter 284.

[4] This Letter of Calvin is printed in the Amst. Ed. Op. vol ix. p. 61, 62; without a date, but among the Letters of 1551. But it seems, obviously, to be an answer to the Letter of Cranmer dated March, 1552; and if so, it is thus fixed to the same year.

the Archbishop for the purpose in question (so far as we are hitherto informed), was a letter of his to Melancthon, dated also in 1552, (March 27), in which he, once more, insists on the expediency of a congregation of men distinguished for judgment and erudition, who might assemble for the determination of controverted points; and signifies the desire of the king that his realm should be the scene of their deliberations [1]. Unhappily, however, the elements of discord proved more powerful than the zeal for religious combination. There were three great principles of repulsion, which kept the reformed Churches at a hopeless distance from each other; namely,—their opinions, first, on ecclesiastical government,—secondly, on that most unmanageable of all questions, the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper,—and thirdly, their comparatively recent disputes on the extent of Christian redemption, and the inscrutable decrees of Almighty God. These difficulties had, from the first, been calamitously aggravated by the distractions of the time, and more especially by the troubles which followed the promulgation of the Interim: and the consequence of these obstructions was, that the Primate was, at last, though most reluctantly, compelled to limit his views to his own country [2]; and to content himself with the compilation of a set of Articles, which (as he

The design of a union abandoned.

[1] Cranmer's Remains, vol. i. p. 348. Letter 285. All the letters of Cranmer on this interesting design, may be found in this volume, p. 331. 337, 344. 346. 348.

[2] Strype's Cranmer, b. iii. c. 25.

subsequently expressed himself), might shortly produce "such a concord and quietness in Religion, as otherwise could not be expected for many years; whereby God should be glorified, his truth advanced, and the promoters of the undertaking rewarded by him, as the setters forward of his true word and Gospel [1]."

Compilation of the 42 Articles of Religion.

The history of this compilation, so far as dates are concerned, is, briefly, as follows: In the course of 1551, the Archbishop received the orders of the King in Council, to commence the work. In the May following, the first draft of it was completed, and laid before the Council. In the month of September, in the same year, it was again in the hands of the Archbishop, for the purpose of revision; and on the 19th of September was submitted, with corrections, to Sir John Cheke, the King's Tutor, and to secretary Cecil, who was frequently consulted by Cranmer in matters relating to the settlement of religion. On the second of October the draft was delivered over to the six Royal Chaplains, Harley, Bill, Horne, Grindal, Perne, and the renowned John Knox, who was then in England, and attached to the Court. On the 20th of November, Cranmer received it back; and having given it his last revision, he returned it to the Council on the 24th of November, together with a letter, expressing the sentiments above adverted to, and containing a petition that they would procure an order

[1] See his Letter to the Council, Nov. 24, 1552, Strype, Cranmer, b. ii. c. 27. Appendix, No. 64.

from the King, authorizing the Bishops to cause all their Clergy to subscribe the Articles in question. The King's final mandate to this effect was not issued till May, 1553, a few days before his death[1]. So that, upwards of two years elapsed, between the first order for their preparation, and the time of their final appearance with the Royal sanction.

It may be presumed that the chief causes of the very deliberate progress of this work, were, first, the unwillingness of the Archbishop to surrender all hope of accomplishing the more comprehensive design of Melancthon; and secondly, the anxiety of himself, and his associates in the task, to send it into the world as complete and invulnerable as knowledge or industry could make it. The history of the times does not enable us to trace it clearly from its first imperfect draft to its last and finished state. The Confession of Augsburgh was probably one main source from which the compilation was derived. But there is considerable reason for believing that the Articles agreed on between the English and German Divines, in 1538, was the authority more immediately in contemplation[2]. Who were the principal coadjutors

[1] See his Letter to the Council, Nov. 24, 1552, Strype, Cranm. b. ii. c. 27. Append. No. 64.

[2] There is in the State Paper office a thin folio MS. among Cranmer's papers, entitled, "A Boke conteyning divers Articles De Unitate Dei, et Trinitate Personarum,—De Peccato Originali, &c. &c." tied up in the same bundle with other documents, relating chiefly to the negociations with the foreign Reformers. This book is manifestly founded on the Augsburgh Confession,

of the Archbishop, in the completion of this work, has not been ascertained. It is scarcely credible that he would proceed a step in such an undertaking, without at least consulting Ridley, and the other most eminent Churchmen attached to the Reformation. But it is scarcely doubtful that the main responsibility rested upon Cranmer himself. Indeed, he afterwards nearly confessed as much in his examination before Brokes. According to the official report of those proceedings, in Latin, he allowed that his judgment and counsel had been employed in putting forth the Catechism and Articles [1].

Cranmer principally responsible for the 42 Articles.

There still hangs some obscurity about the question, by what Ecclesiastical authority these 42 Articles were submitted to the King in Council. They were first published by Grafton, the King's Printer, in July,

Whether the Articles were sanctioned by the Convocation?

often following it very closely; and departing from it exactly in those instances, where the mixture of English with German Theology might have been expected to cause a variation. This, therefore, in all probability, is the Formulary agreed upon between the English and Foreign Divines, alluded to Ante, vol. i. p. 179, 180.—See the Editor's Preface to Cranmer's Remains, p. 23, 24; where cogent reasons are given for the surmise that this Formulary must, likewise, have been the channel "through which the language of the German Confession was introduced into the English Articles of Edward VI."

[1] See his Remains, vol. iv. p. 102—106. The Catechism here alluded to, is not that of Justus Jonas: but another set forth, by Royal authority, at the same time with the Articles. See post, p. 236.

1533, with the following title—"Articles agreed on by the Bishops, and other learned men in England, in the Synod, 1552." In the same year, there was
1552. published a Catechism[1], "commended by Royal authority to all schoolmasters;" and to this Catechism were subjoined the Articles agreed on in the last Convocation of London, A.D. 1552[2], by the Bishops and other learned men. In this publication, it is evident that the Articles appear merely as an adjunct, or appendix; and for this reason it was that the whole together, usually went by the name of "*the Catechism*." It also appears that the title of the work distinctly claims the authority of the Synod for the Articles themselves; but

[1] The author of this Catechism is not known. Some have ascribed it to Bishop Ponet. Strype says it was certainly written by Alexander Nowel, and that his celebrated Catechism, published in the reign of Elizabeth, was only an extension of it.—Eccl. Mem. vol. ii. b. ii. c. 15.

[2] It was published both in Latin and English. The Latin title runs thus: "Catechismus brevis, Christianæ Disciplinæ summam continens, omnibus Ludimagistris auctoritate Regia commendatus.—Huic Catechismo adjuncti sunt Articuli, de quibus, in ultimâ Synodo Londinensi, A.D. 1552, inter Episcopos et alios eruditos viros convenerat, Regiâ similiter authoritate promulgati." It is curious enough, that in one particular the Catechism is contradictory to the Articles: for, in the explanation of the Lord's Prayer, it exhorts Christians to pray, "ut Christus solus regnet, cum suis Sanctis, secundum divinas promissiones, utque vivat et dominetur in mundo;" whereas the 41st Article has these words—"Qui Millenariorum fabulam revocare conantur, sacris literis adversantur."—See Laur. Bampt. Lect. p. 225. Ed. 1820.

that it makes no such claim on behalf of the Catechism which accompanied them. It is further remarkable, that, in the reign of Elizabeth, the amended Articles were set forth with a recital, which speaks of the original ones as agreed upon by the Synod of 1552.

But, notwithstanding this evidence, it is asserted by Burnet, that the Articles never received the sanction both of the Upper and Lower House of Convocation, although he admits that they were probably submitted to the consideration of the Upper House [1]. The confusion has, probably, arisen from the circumstance stated above,—namely, that the Articles, which *were* sanctioned by the Convocation, were printed together with the Catechism which had *not* received that sanction; but which, yet, with this mark of inferiority upon it, gave its name to the whole publication, Articles included. With what precise degree of formality the authority of the Convocation may have been given to the Articles, must, indeed, still remain a matter of dispute. Their title imports that they had been agreed upon, in Convocation, *by the Bishops and other learned men*; which may possibly imply, that they were not regularly discussed in full Synod, but that they were settled by a committee chosen out of both Houses, and authorised to consent in the name of the whole [2], as the Preface to the Latin edition of the Articles would seem to indicate.

[1] Burnet. vol. iii. p. 211. Ed. 1715. An. 1552.
[2] Nares' Burghly, vol. i. p. 369.

It is probable that the final promulgation of this *form of sound words* was impatiently expected by all who were anxious for the restoration of the Gospel. One zealous man, Bishop Hoper, who afterwards underwent the baptism of fire at the stake, was urgent in his protestations against delay: for it appears that, in 1552, this Prelate had obtained a copy of the Articles, which he had caused the Clergy of his diocese to subscribe. This measure, however, had been found to be wholly inefficacious; for, in the July of the same year, he wrote as follows, to Secretary Cecil:—"For the love of God, cause the Articles, that the King's Majesty spake of when we took our oaths, to be set forth by his authority. I doubt not but they shall do much good: for I will cause every Minister to confess them *openly before their parishioners*. For *subscribing privately in the paper, I perceive, little availeth*. For, notwithstanding that, they speak as evil of good faith, as ever they did before they subscribed [1]." Indeed, nearly the whole of the foregoing narrative must show, that the state of religion was such as loudly called for some authoritative standard of public opinion. It has appeared, but too clearly, that, when the Papal system was broken to pieces in England, a multitude of smaller Papacies sprung up out of the fragments. Sometimes the *Infallibility* was transferred to the leader of a petty sect: at other times a dreaming enthu-

The necessity for such a Formulary.

[1] Strype's Cranmer, Append. No. 48.

siast would become his own Pope, and would consult nothing but the oracle within his own breast. Tradition, indeed, was deposed from its usurped dominion; but the legitimate authority of Scripture frequently gained but little from the change. One usurpation was only followed by another; and Reason was elevated to the vacant throne, which ought to have been filled by the Majesty of Revelation. The personal nature and dignity of the Saviour began to be a subject of rash discussion among men, who looked with contempt upon the mysticism of the fanatic; and the fanatic, on his part, repaid their scorn, with an ample measure of that abhorrence which is due to positive blasphemy! The Papist had diluted down the depravity of our nature, till it had, well nigh, lost its noxious and fatal quality; and, if he did not altogether discard the grace of God, he treated it as a sort of very humble auxiliary to the moral powers of man. But, strange, indeed, was the divergency of the paths, by which the truth was sought, when once the ancient errors were abandoned. On one hand, the enthusiast invested the grace of God with an irresistible sovereignty, and pronounced upon the capacities of human nature a desperate sentence of attainder, leaving the children of Adam almost without a relic of that power, which is needful for the responsible agency of any created being. On the other hand, the Anabaptist derided the corruption of our faculties as an idle and visionary fancy; and *lifted up his heel* against the doctrines of Divine grace, as he would lift it up against idolatry, or superstitious vanity. What was still more to be

lamented, these courses, widely diverse as they were, both of them led the wanderer into regions, where virtue, as well as faith, was constantly in danger of shipwreck: and the effect was seen in the licentious principles, and the profligate habits, which were contracted in those wild voyages of religious discovery; and which seemed, at times, to threaten little less than a dissolution of the whole fabric of society. The picture here presented of the condition of morals and religion at this feverish period, may, perhaps, appear to be rather fiercely coloured: but its correctness is, unhappily, vindicated, not merely by the passionate invective of adversaries, but by the bitter, and almost despairing complaints of the leaders of Reformation. And it is absolutely necessary that our eye should steadily be fixed upon it, if we would form an accurate judgment of the views, which guided the compilation of our articles of religion.

The Articles not Predestinarian.

It is well known that this Formulary is frequently and confidently appealed to, at the present day, by persons who fancy that its compilers discovered a system of qualified fatalism in the scheme of Christian redemption: and, by such persons, the great body of the Clergy of the Church of England are sometimes challenged to look into the Articles they have subscribed, and there to read themselves convicted of apostasy from the faith of the *Reformers*[1]. It forms no part of our design

[1] The very essence of ignorant misrepresentation seems to be concentrated in a saying, attributed, I believe, to the illustrious Lord Chatham; namely, that the English Church has a Popish Liturgy, Calvinistic Articles, and an Arminian Clergy.

to furnish a controversial reply to this misconception [1]. It may, nevertheless, be expedient to present to the reader's attention certain prominent considerations, which may enable him to form a safe and competent judgment on the point.

In the first place, then, it is to be recollected that Archbishop Cranmer must, beyond all question, be regarded as the chief compiler of the Articles of 1552; and nothing, I believe, would be more hopeless than the attempt to show, that the doctrine of personal predestination, or any other opinion of the same kindred, ever, for an instant, darkened his Creed. The spirit which animated his proceedings, was principally Lutheran; and Melancthon was the representative of Lutheranism, to whom his thoughts were constantly directed. Now, there is no one point in the history of the Reformation more indisputable than this—that Melancthon was the adversary of every thing resembling fatalism, whether philosophical or Christian,—and that, when Calvin began to build up his scheme of predestination, the author of the Augsburgh Confession was deaf to all the applications by which the "Zeno of his day" (as he was then frequently termed) endeavoured to win him over to something like conformity with his notions [2]. It is true that Melancthon, (as well as Luther,) in

[1] Archbishop Laurence's Bampton Lecture will either provide the reader with all the knowledge which can be necessary for his information, or at all events, will direct him where to find it.

[2] Laur. Bampt. Lect. p. 422, 423.

the outset of his inquiries, got himself entangled in what he afterwards called, sometimes the *Stoical*, and sometimes the *Manichéan*, perversions. But it is also undeniable, that he very speedily extricated himself from the labyrinth, and intímated his deliverance to the world, by expunging the ungracious doctrines from his *Loci Theologici*, so early as the year 1535 [1]. Luther, indeed, made no formal retractation of any opinion: he was without leisure, or without patience, for a revisal of his writings. But in his last work of importance he laments that, after his death, his writings would probably fortify multitudes in their errors and "*delirations;*" and he therefore adds a solemn warning, that we are not to inquire concerning the *predestination* of a hidden God, but, purely, to acquiesce in the things which are revealed by our vocation and the ministry of the word [2].

Cranmer not a Predestinarian.

Such were the models which Cranmer had perpetually before his eyes: and there can be no reasonable doubt, that his own personal views respecting these questions, were, throughout, substantially in harmony with theirs. That he had no esteem for doctrines savouring of fatalism, may be collected from a letter of his to Cromwell [3], in which he mentions a turbulent and

[1] Laur. Bamp. Lect. p. 410, 411.

[2] Ibid. p. 258, 259. Ed. 1820.

[3] This letter has already been alluded to Ante, vol. i. p. 156, 157. It is now printed in Cranmer's Remains, vol. i. p. 159, 160. Lett. 165.

fanatical Priest, who, in spite of all that *his own Chaplains* could do with him in the way of reasoning, was immoveably persuaded that, like Esau, he was created unto damnation, and was with great difficulty prevented from putting an end to his suppense by self-destruction. The same thing may further be concluded from his selection of the Paraphrase of Erasmus, as a book of popular instruction; for Erasmus was the rational champion of the freedom of the human will, and the adversary of all extravagance, whether in the shape of superstition or fanaticism. It is rendered next to certain by the general tenor of his own writings, in which he appears as the decided advocate of universal Redemption, and an election, through Baptism, to the privileges of the Christian covenant; doctrines conspicuous in the Liturgical offices of our Church, but at mortal variance with the whole theory of Calvin [1].

It must further be considered, that to claim the Articles of 1552, as monuments of a *Calvinistic* faith, is, in truth, little better than a downright anachronism. It was not till late in the year 1551, that Calvin began to be renowned as the great champion of the predestinarian doctrine. That he maintained this doctrine before that period, is, indeed, unquestionable: but his notions had, then, brought him any thing but homage and reputation. On the contrary, they exposed him to invective, even within his

[1] Laur. Bamp. Lect. p. 329, &c. and p. 450, &c. Ed. 1820.

own narrow sphere, as the abettor of a system which made God the author of sin. The attack upon him, in his Church, by Jerome Bolsec, in 1551, was a signal for the formal commencement of the controversy, subsequently known by the denomination of *Calvinistic:* and it is the boast of Theodore Beza, (the disciple, and almost the worshipper, of Calvin,) that, in consequence of these debates, the questions relative to the free-will of man, and the decrees of God, were illustrated with a distinctness, *utterly unknown to the ancient Christian writers*[1]. Combine with these circumstances, the fact, that the compilation of our Articles was completed early in 1552, and the absurdity of ascribing to them a Calvinistic origin, will be irresistibly obvious. The fame of the mighty master himself was, at that time, but just above the horizon. The way to his future supremacy, was, for the most part, still to be won. So that the world, as yet, was scarcely in full possession of the secret which, according to the confession of Beza, had well nigh escaped the sagacity of the primitive Doctors of the Church.

It is another important consideration, that, if the Articles were dictated by a reverential regard for the sentiments either of Calvin or Augustine, the framers of them must have made up their minds to pour contempt on their own Liturgy. A collection of offices like ours, followed up by a decidedly predestinarian confession, would have been a perfect monster. No

[1] See Beza's Life of Calvin, ad an. 1551.

one, who has ever studied the character of Archbishop Cranmer, can believe that he would have lent his name to a combination so extravagant. Nothing can be more unlike the cautious and wary temper of his proceedings, than a sudden leap, from the ground on which he had laboured for the preparation of our Liturgy, into the dark abyss of Calvinistic fatalism. His mantle fell, at length, upon a Protestant successor, animated by a spirit similar to his own. Early in the reign of Elizabeth, the Articles were revised, under the superintendence of Archbishop Parker: but even then, no infusion of Calvinism was admitted. The source of the corrections was, manifestly, the confession of Wirtemberg, (a compendium of the Lutheran confession of Augsburgh,) drawn up in 1551, for the purpose of being exhibited to the Council of Trent, and not impressed with a single lineament of Calvinism[1]. In the course of time, however, men of a different spirit succeeded. The Calvinistic fever became, for a while, almost epidemic: and towards the end of Elizabeth's reign, certain of our leading Divines[2], with our *truly* Catholic Liturgy before their eyes, laboured to perfect our Articles by an ample introduction of the Genevan Doctrine. A subsequent testimony to the liberal spirit of this confession was borne, at a later period, by the Westminster Divines, whose first attempt at remodelling the Church, was a review of the Articles,

[1] See Laur. Bampt. Lect. p. 45—103; and 240—243. Ed. 1820.
[2] The patrons of the Lambeth Articles.

and this too with the avowed design of making them "more determinate in favour of Calvinism;" a design which was still cherished by the same party at the celebrated Savoy Conference after the Restoration [1]. If, then, Archbishop Cranmer and his coadjutors intended to give a Calvinistic complexion to their performance, they must have wrought in that behalf like very timid or unskilful artists. The whole Anglican Reformation never found much favour in the eyes of the Genevan school, even at the period of its completion: and it appears that, subsequently to that period, the same school has been repeatedly at work to bring that Reformation to a more worthy conformity with their own model of exclusion.

Cranmer not a Puritan.

It has been sometimes intimated, that the very moderation of Cranmer was not, in reality, his own, but that it was actually forced upon him by the unhappy peculiarities of his position;—that he was, all along, a puritan in his heart,—and that the Liturgy itself was a monument, not of his sobriety of spirit, but rather of the ungodly compulsion which withheld him from more effectual improvement. A report of this description was circulated among the English exiles at Frankfort, during the reign of persecution. It was affirmed, upon the alleged authority of Bullinger, that "Cranmer had drawn up a Book of Prayers *a hundred times more perfect* than that which was then in being; but that he was defeated in his attempts to bring it forward,

[1] Neal, Hist. Pur. iii. p. 55. App. No. 7; and iv. p. 298.

partly by the wickedness of the Clergy and Convocation, and partly by the devices of his other adversaries[1]." A rumour like this, is, upon the face of it, well nigh self-destructive. It is in manifest contradiction to the whole tenour of Cranmer's life and opinions. The sort of *perfection* which, according to this surmise, he would (if left in a state of complete free-agency) have introduced into the Service Book, may easily be imagined: and it is very safe to affirm, that of such *perfection* he never was enamoured, at any period of his life. We have seen above how vigorously he resisted the fantastic scruples of Bishop Hoper, relative to the Episcopal habit,—and this, even when those scruples were countenanced by the Sovereign himself: and it is hardly credible, that he, who made so resolute a stand against the puritanical spirit, in a matter of mere external form, was ever prepared to give it encouragement, in questions supposed to involve the vital principles of Christianity. But, further, the notion is in direct opposition to the indisputable fact, that, at the period of this compilation, the ascendency of Cranmer, at least in matters of religion, was more commanding than ever. He possessed the confidence of the Council, and was generally sure of their support, except when he withstood their profligate schemes of spoliation. His wisdom, learning, and long experience, secured him the reverence of the Divines: and his influence was, altogether, such as to overpower, for the time, the re-

[1] Strype, Cranmer, b. ii. c. 26.

sistance of all but the most bigotted and incorrigible Romanists. To imagine, therefore, upon the strength of a hearsay report from Zurich, that the opinions of the Archbishop had been overruled, in an affair of such importance as the composition of a national Liturgy, would be to deal with evidence, in a manner unheard of among reasonable men. Besides,—it is far from easy to comprehend how the "wicked Clergy and Convocation," who would not hear of a "*more perfect*" Liturgy, should, nevertheless, patiently endure an approach to Puritanical *perfection*, in a national Formulary of Religious Doctrine.

The Articles framed chiefly with a view to the contest between the Romish and Protestant opinions.

The truth of the matter is, that the English Reformers framed their Articles, not as a wall of partition between Protestant and Protestant; but as a bulwark against the perversions with which the scholastic Theology had disfigured the simplicity of the Gospel. So far as they had an eye to the disputes which were beginning to distract the Protestant world, comprehension, and not exclusion, was, manifestly, their purpose. *Mitigation of controversies*[1] was the grand object which Melancthon

[1] In a letter to Cranmer, so early as 1535, Melancthon says,—"Is (Alexander Alesius Scotus) proficiscitur in Britanniam, ut exhibeat Reverentiæ tuæ quoddam meum scriptum, in quo animadvertet Reverenda Paternitas Tua me conatum esse, ut diligenter et utiliter explicarem, et, quantum possem, *mitigarem, plerasque controversias.*" Laur. Bampt. Lect. p. 231. Ed. 1820. It must, nevertheless, be remembered, that Melancthon seems always to have been averse to the principle of opening the door

had constantly upon his lips, and in his heart: and, in precisely the same spirit, our original Articles, as their title professes, were framed "for the *avoiding of controversy* in opinions, and the establishment of a *godly concord* in certain matters of religion." And it cannot be denied that, upon the whole, the success of the project was answerable to its liberal design; for, in spite of the discordant speculations which agitated the Church and Kingdom in the time of James I., that monarch felt himself in a condition to affirm, in the declaration prefixed by him to the Articles, that "all Clergymen within his realm had always most willingly subscribed them." The only key, therefore, which can readily unlock the true sense of the Articles, is a knowledge,—not of the opinions which afterwards rent the great Protestant community into fragments,—but of the Papal doctrines against which the main struggle of the Reformers had been carried on from the very first. The Schoolmen, for instance, held that original sin was little more than a corporeal

of comprehension *too wide*, by studied ambiguity of language. He was anxious that controverted doctrines should be set forth with perspicuity and distinctness. See Strype, Cranm. b. iii. c. 24. He confesses, however, that "the stoical disputes on *the Doctrine of Fate*, were, in the beginning, so rough and bristling, as to be prejudicial to discipline." It is difficult to see how this evil is to be avoided, or mitigated, in a great national Church, otherwise than by considerable latitude of expression, in its statement of doubtful and controverted matters. And if there be any question respecting which such latitude is warrantable, surely it is that which relates to the secret and inscrutable counsels of the Deity.

or physical infection; that it introduced into the human system a *fomes peccati*,—a fuel of mischief and of vice,—which might, or might not, be kindled by the action of the will. The Lutherans, on the contrary, contended for a corruption or deterioration, in one sense *total*,—inasmuch as it extends to the whole nature of man. They left, however, undefined the precise *degree of intensity* in which his nature is affected by that depravation; but, assuredly, they did not hold it to be such, as to obliterate our moral faculties, or to render a miracle of Divine Grace necessary for our restoration even to the privileges and capacities of responsible agency. The scholastic divinity taught, that the moral powers of man might be so *meritoriously* exerted, as to win for him, by what they called *congruity*, the aids of the Holy Spirit,—and that, by this assistance, he might rise to the *dignity* of deserving the rewards of heaven. The Reformers maintained, in opposition to this pernicious theory, that, from first to last, the merits of his Redeemer form the only resources of a Christian's hope. The Predestination of the Scholastics was, the everlasting purpose of God to confer grace and glory on such *individuals* as shall deserve the first by *congruity*, and the latter by *condignity*. As viewed by the Lutherans, the decree of the Almighty was, to elect, or call,—not out of particular communities, but generally *out of the human race*,—an aggregate Body or Church, the members of which were to be indebted for their acceptance with him, not to their own personal qualities or doings, but to his free and unde-

served mercy. But it was, further, their persuasion that, without the due exertion of those moral faculties which the Fall has left us, it will be impossible for us to make this calling and election sure. The contrast cannot be pursued further, without plunging into a theological discussion, which would be foreign to the purpose of the present work. The subject must, therefore, be dismissed with this one remark:—if any person could but sit down to the perusal of our Articles, in utter forgetfulness that Europe had ever been seriously agitated by the Calvinistic dispute, and with nothing in his mind but the controversy between Reformed Churches and the Church of Rome,—he would then clearly perceive that those Articles were constructed, for the most part, on the Lutheran system, and principally as a rampart against the almost unchristian Theology of the Schools. On the other hand, he would find that the fortress was made ample enough to include, within its pale, a large variety of *Protestant* opinion, relative to the secret and mysterious counsels of the Most High[1].

[1] It is well known how perniciously the questions respecting Free Will, and Predestination, began to operate, even in the season of persecution. These elements of discord actually found their way into the dungeons, where Protestant martyrs were awaiting the horrors of the stake; and they converted the prison-house into a school of bitter controversy! See Strype, Cranm. b. iii. c. 14. Many particulars of these disputes have been preserved, in a small quarto MS. in the Bodleian Library. (No. 1972. Catal. MS.) It appears that, at one time, certain articles of concord were drawn up; which, however, the Predestinarians refused to subscribe. The doctrine maintained by Trew, the

While the Primate was labouring to rear up the structure of our national faith, his enemies were meanly and maliciously active in poisoning the mind of the King with slanders against him, and the whole Episcopal order. The courtiers were, at that time, in complete possession of the royal ear. Cranmer had passed the summer in privacy, at one or other of his country residences; his Majesty, in the mean time, was making a progress through his dominions. This excursion had been suggested by Northumber-

Antipredestinarian leader, was Lutheran; that of Bradford, was a milder Calvinism. If Trew's representation be correct, the faith of the Calvinistic party was, by no means, a *faith which wrought by love*: "for," says he, "they did rail on us, and call us heretics, cast dust in our faces, and give sentence of damnation on us, and excommunicated us, and would neither eat nor drink with us, nor yet bid us God speed." Nay,—if we are to believe him,—they were not careful to add to their faith, virtue, or even common integrity or humanity; for, he adds, they "did keep away such money as was given them, in common, to distribute among them that did lie [in prison] for the truth; and caused us to be locked up, that we should speak to nobody, by their minds, lest we should warn them of their false and erroneous opinions...... and for no other cause, but that our conscience, grounded on God's word, would not suffer us to be of that sect." Laur. Bampt. Lect. pp. 457—462. Ed. 1820. It should be remembered, however, that Bradford, who at one period was the purse-bearer, solemnly denies the charge of fraud or partiality. Strype, Cranm. b. iii. c. 14.

The above is a melancholy picture, and yet it has some features of moral grandeur about it; for what can exhibit, more powerfully, the triumph of the spirit over the flesh, than conflicts like these, among victims whom the flames were ready to devour?

land, partly with a view to divert the thoughts of the Sovereign from the melancholy fate of his uncle, the late Protector; and it furnished the rapacious courtiers with a precious opportunity of renewing their calumnies against the avarice and the parsimony of the Archbishop and his brethren. The Prelates,—it was sedulously whispered—were inordinately wealthy; and their riches were not expended in deeds of hospitality and benevolence, such as became the sacred profession; but were either lavished in pomp and luxury, or hoarded, with miserly care, for the benefit of their families and connections. The true version of all such representations is too obvious to need exposure. The urgency, however, with which they were now advanced, is manifested by a letter from secretary Cecil to Cranmer, in which he took upon himself to caution his friend against the evils of covetousness, and to remind him that *they who will be rich, fall into temptation and a snare*. Whether this admonition was given with sinister or charitable intent, it may not be very easy to pronounce with confidence. It must, nevertheless, be confessed, that it came from rather a suspicious quarter: for it is certain, that a disregard to his own secular interests was not among the weaknesses of the wisest of statesmen [1]. That

Cranmer falsely suspected of covetousness by Cecil.

[1] Calvin appears to have been fully aware that *prudence* stood high on the list of Cecil's cardinal virtues; and he gives him a very plain hint to that effect, in one of his letters:—" So long as there was an open butchery of the children of God, you were silent, with the rest. Now, at least, when, by the recent and incredible

his patrimony was, to some extent, augmented from the pillage of the Church, is quite undeniable; and it has even been alleged, that his share of the spoil was scandalously great[1]. But whatever may have been the motives of his adviser, the Archbishop's reply to his counsel is abundantly temperate and candid. "As for your admonition," he says, "I take it most thankfully, as I have ever been most glad to be admonished by my friends; accounting no man so foolish as he that will not bear friendly admonishments. But, as for the saying of St. Paul, *qui volunt ditescere, incidunt in tentationem*, I fear it not half so much as I do stark beggary. For I took not half so much care for my living, when I was a scholar at Cambridge, as I do at this present. For although I have now much more revenue, yet I have much more to do withal: and

His Answer to Cecil.

goodness of God, an ampler liberty is restored, it becomes you to collect your courage, and thus to compensate for your former timidity." Calv. to Cec. Jan. 29, 1559. Op. tom. ix. epist. p. 1336, ed. Amst. 1667.

[1] It is affirmed by Henry Wharton, that "he gave but bad evidence of his favour to the clergy, and estate of the Church, when many years after this, (the revenue of the Church being then, also, much more diminished than it was at the time of this design) he tore away from the bishopric of Peterborough the far better part of the lands and revenues wherewith it had been endowed; which he effected by procuring Bishop Scamler to be translated from thence to Norwich, which translation, by the baseness of that Bishop, conspiring with the sacrilegious greediness of two potent courtiers, was the ruin of both those bishoprics." Henry Wharton's observations on Strype's Cranmer, p. 1055, Oxford edition. But see Nares's Life of Burghly, vol. i. p. 384.

have more care to live now as an Archbishop, than I had, at that time, to live like a scholar. I have not so much, as I had within ten years past, by £150 of certain rent, besides casualties. *I pay double for every thing that I buy.* If a good auditor have this account, he shall find no great surplusage to wax rich upon. And if I knew any Bishop that were covetous, I would surely admonish him: but I know none; but all beggars, except it be one; and yet, I dare well say, he is not very rich. If you know any, I beseech you to advertise *me;* for, peradventure, I may advertise him better than you.

"To be short,—I am not so doted, to set my mind upon things here; which neither I can carry away with me, nor tarry long with them. If time would have served, I would have written other things; but your servant making haste, compelleth me to cut off the thread: beseeching Almighty God to preserve the King's Majesty with all his council and family, and send him well to return from his progress. From my Manor of Croydon, 21st July," [1552][1].

Of the use made by Cecil of this frank and honest statement, no account has been preserved. The production of it might have put to shame any but men whose mouth was as an open sepulchre, and whose desires were like the grave! The whole tenor of the Archbishop's life was, in fact, a perpetual commentary on the text which he now despatched to the sagacious Secretary. It appears from two letters of his which have recently been discovered, that, in

[1] Strype's Cranmer, App. No. 67.

the year 1533, his necessities had compelled him to solicit a loan of 1000 marks from the crown; and that, in 1535, when Hethe (afterwards Archbishop of York, but then only Archdeacon of Stafford,) was about to proceed on a foreign diplomatic mission, the Primate besought the kind offices of Cromwell, to procure from the King the means of his necessary outfit; alleging that his own pecuniary difficulties were such as wholly disabled him from assisting the Royal envoy[1]. It further appears, from various parts of his correspondence[2], that he was frequently embarrassed by debts, most assuredly not contracted by culpable unthriftiness, but occasioned purely by the inadequacy of his resources to the scale of his generous and charitable expenditure. He is fain to bespeak the good offices of Cromwell with the King, under his occasional difficulties; and more than once expresses himself thankful even for the gift of a buck, for the purposes of hospitality! Besides, it must have been distinctly in the recollection of his calumniators, that Henry had, formerly, rebuked the crafty malice of Sir Thomas Seymour, by despatching him with a message to Lambeth, at an hour which was sure to disclose to him the noble and liberal style of the

[1] These two letters were first printed from the original MSS., in the Chapter House at Westminster, in Todd's Cranmer, vol. i. p. 99. 148.—And they now appear in the first vol. of Cranmer's Remains, p. 74. 86. among the rest of his letters.

[2] This correspondence occupies the first vol. of the recent Oxford edit. of his works

Primate's household [1]. It must also have been perfectly well known, that his palace was generally filled with learned and worthy strangers, chiefly from Germany, to whom he generously afforded an asylum, when the troubles of the continent drove them from their country: and it can scarcely have been *unknown* that he, likewise, had upon his pension-list, the names of many a foreign exhibitioner, to each of whom he allowed an annual salary. If, indeed, the representations of one of his own household are to be trusted, his liberality to these absentees was so disproportioned to the amount of his revenue, that it was the cause of discontent among the officers attached to his establishment. For, ample as his hospitality was, it was alleged by one of these persons, in the reign of Henry, that his mode of entertainment might have been still more befitting his high station, but for these burdensome demands on his munificence. "It is no wonder," said the individual in question, "that his Lordship did not keep a better house; for he hath so many exhibitioners in Germany, that all is too little to scrape and get together, to send thither." These murmurs of a dissatisfied domestic are not, indeed, to be heard as an impeachment of the Primate's style of housekeeping: but, even if the complaint were just, it would still utterly destroy the insinuation, that he was haunted by an unbecoming impatience to be rich [2].

It may, perhaps, appear extraordinary to find an Archbishop of Canterbury representing himself as in

[1] See Ante, vol. i. c. ix. p. 264.

[2] Strype's Cranmer, b. ii. c. 31.

danger of "*beggary:*" but it must not be forgotten that very ample resources indeed must have been required to maintain the splendour, which, at that time, was universally considered as a proper appendage to his rank: and which was exacted by public opinion with a rigor which, as we have seen, it was no easy matter to satisfy. It is also to be observed, that the princely domains of the See of Canterbury had undergone a process of formidable retrenchment, in the reign of his first Master. He was, then, under the necessity of consenting to various exchanges of property, which grievously reduced the income of the Archbishopric[1]; partly because the Royal will was irresistible, and, partly, because he conceived it would be far less ruinous to fall into the hands of the King, than to be torn to pieces by the harpies of the Court. The charge of avarice, however, is not an imputation which has permanently adhered to the name of Cranmer. Nothing but a strange combination of malignity and folly could now suggest the revival of such an accusation. It would be to imagine a vain thing, to load with the charge of covetousness the memory of a man, whose hospitality could silence the slanders of a man like Seymour,—and who was celebrated over Europe as the munificent protector of Scholars, and Divines, and men who were driven to banishment for their fidelity to the Protestant cause.

[1] The particulars of these exchanges cannot be interesting to the general reader. They who are curious about such matters, may find the details in Strype's Cranmer, b. ii. c. 29.

CHAPTER XIV.

1551—1553.

Project for a Reformation of the Ecclesiastical Laws—Difficulty of Spiritual Discipline in a great National Church—The Canon Law—Code of Ecclesiastical Law prepared under Henry VIII., but not signed by him—The Design revived under Edward VI.—Commission, for that purpose, to Cranmer, and seven others—Code compiled by them—Edward dies without authorizing it—Published since, under the title Reformatio *Legum Ecclesiasticarum—Probable causes of the failure of the project—Intended mitigation of the punishment of heresy—Cranmer naturally disposed to mildness and moderation—Considerations on the want of Discipline in our Church—State of opinions and morals during the progress of the Reformation—Commission to Cranmer, and several Gentlemen, to recover embezzled property, lately belonging to the Chantries, &c.—Reasons for his unwillingness to act—Northumberland's project for altering the succession—Cranmer's share in it considered—Sorrowful presentiments of the Reformers.*

Project for a Reformation of the Ecclesiastical Laws.

The last, and, perhaps, the most difficult work which occupied Archbishop Cranmer, was the attempt to establish an effective system of Ecclesiastical Law; and it was the only one of his great undertakings which proved, in the end, altogether abortive. The design had been entertained since 1532; and had deeply engaged the

thoughts of the Archbishop since the year 1544; but it was not till the present reign that the attempt was brought to any semblance of perfection.

Difficulty of spiritual discipline in a great National Church.

Of all the problems which can task the wisdom and the piety of man, there is none, perhaps, more full of perplexity, than the construction of a scheme of spiritual discipline, for a great national and established Church. When Christian communities were small, and surrounded by societies lost in the outer darkness of paganism, the task of spiritual government was one of comparative facility. Communion with the Church was, in primitive times, regarded as the highest and most transcendent of privileges. To be cast out from all participation in her services and Sacraments, and to be held by her as a heathen and a publican, was of all sentences which could be pronounced upon a believer, the most tremendous. It was dreaded as a suspension of all those hopes which can sweeten the enjoyments, or mitigate the calamities of life. It was almost to be driven back from the regions of God's marvellous light, deep into the valley of the shadow of death. In these latter days, we can scarcely form a conception of the dismay with which a sinful brother heard himself condemned to such a separation. By the doom of excommunication he was shut out—not, indeed, from all possibility of forgiveness,—but from the privilege of hearing the words of pardon authoritatively pronounced by the consecrated ministers of God. The sinner who should remain impenitent till a late moment of the

eleventh hour,—or he whose transgressions were of so deep a die that no penitential tears could wash out the stain which they left upon the Church,—might possibly receive pardon in the next world; but he could receive no assurance of pardon in this. The Church could not declare him absolved, or admit him back to her consolatory offices. He was, therefore, left to die, not in absolute despair, but in a state of uncertainty and terror, which must have often driven the sinner almost to the very brink of desperation. And hence it was, that years of contrition, and sorrow, and rigorous self-infliction, were frequently submitted to, to secure, in time, this restoration of the transgressor to the ark of Christ's Church, and his deliverance from the deep waters, in which his soul was in imminent danger of perishing. In circumstances like these, when the followers of the Cross were, comparatively, but a little flock, the spiritual authority was a powerful preservative of human virtue. But, when the visible boundaries of the Church were enlarged, the case was widely different. And, afterwards,—when the world was called after the name of Christ,—to be a Christian was, unhappily, no longer regarded as an honour so high and so inestimable, as in the primitive days. The disciples of the Saviour could no longer be so effectually called upon, to exhibit the glorious contrast between the Christian and the Heathen character, when open heathenism was no more. The fold was then invaded by numbers, who wore, indeed, the fleeces of the flock, but who, inwardly, were little

better than the ravening wolves by which, in earlier times, the sheep were constantly surrounded and devoured. The inevitable consequence was, that the discipline of the Church was gradually overpowered by the abounding of iniquity. The suppression of personal vice, and the enforcement of what are called duties of imperfect obligation, became a task far too mighty for the human ministers of the *powers of the world to come.* To expel the offender from the Church, when the Church was nearly identified with the whole community, was, in effect, to drive him beyond the pale of human society,—to convert him into a desperate outcast,—to send him forth with a mark like that of Cain upon his forehead. The punishment, if rigorously inflicted, was greater than man could bear; and the terrors of it would, probably, make more hypocrites than penitents. On the other hand, to relax the severities of spiritual censure, would seem little less than to surrender the whole life and virtue of Christianity. It would be to tolerate many of those very evils, which had made the heathen world abominable in the sight of heaven; to obliterate all the distinctions of *a peculiar people zealous of good works*, and consecrated to the *service of the living God.* It would require a copious treatise, rather than a brief paragraph or two, adequately to describe, on the one hand, the multiplied difficulties, with which this state of things would unavoidably bow down the spirits of the sincere guardians of the faith,—or, on the other, to expose the multiplied temptations which it would offer to

the lust of spiritual dominion. Neither will our limits allow us to trace the steps by which erroneous theological opinions were gradually brought under the edge of the civil sword, on the ground of their frequently involving principles dangerous to the public prosperity and peace. The result, however, may be summed up in very few words. Ecclesiastical discipline degenerated, imperceptibly, into a system of pernicious priestcraft. Its indulgences were, too frequently, so administered, as almost to abolish the supremacy of conscience. Its severities were reserved as instruments for building up a despotism, such as never before had existed, even in the wildest dreams of human ambition.

The Canon law.

The Canon law was the grand magazine in which was deposited the whole apparatus of the Romish discipline: and it was well filled with implements, for branding with the mark of heresy all who disputed the Papal supremacy; and with weapons for the punishment and extirpation of all, who obstinately persevered in their rebellion against it. A system constructed on principles like these, was, of course, inapplicable to a Church which was to undergo the process of Protestant Reformation. No sooner, therefore, was the Pontifical power assailed in this country, than the necessity of revising the Ecclesiastical laws began to force itself upon the attention both of the hierarchy and the government. So early as the year 1532, the Clergy, in their submission to the King, declared, that "there were divers canons injurious to his Majesty's prerogative, and burdensome

to his subjects; and that they were content to commit the revision of them to thirty-two persons, sixteen of the upper and nether house of the temporalty, and other sixteen to be appointed by his most noble Grace [1]." In 1534, an Act was accordingly passed [2], empowering the King to nominate Commissioners. The Act was renewed in 1536 [3], and again in 1544 [4]. In pursuance of this last enactment a code was drawn up, under the superintendence of the Primate, and brought into a state of such completeness, that it wanted nothing but the Royal sanction. In 1645, a letter was actually prepared, addressed to the Clergy and Laity, declaring that "all the laws, decrees, and institutions, which proceeded from the Bishop of Rome, were abrogated and abolished: and that the laws now put forth in their stead, were thenceforth to be observed and obeyed, under pain of the Royal indignation [5]." It does not appear that this mandate ever received the signature of the King: and, whether from the pressure of other important matters, or the secret opposition of Gardiner, and the rest of the Papal faction, the compilation in question remained a lifeless letter. In November, 1549, the project was revived. A new Act was passed, to confer on Edward the same powers which had been granted to his father for his

Code of Ecclesiastical Law prepared under Henry VIII., but not signed by him.

The design revived under Edward VI.

[1] Wilk. Conc. vol. iii. p. 754.
[2] 25 Henry VIII. c. 19.
[3] 27 Henry VIII. c. 15.
[4] 35 Henry VIII. c. 16.
[5] Strype, Cranm. b. i. c. 30; and App. No. 34.

own life. But under this Act nothing effectual was accomplished till Oct. 1551, when eight select Commissioners were appointed by the Royal authority, for a full examination of the ancient canons of the Church, and the preparation of a code which might be suitable to the spiritual jurisdiction of a Protestant country. The Primate, of course, was at the head of this commission. The remaining seven were Thomas Goodrich, Bishop of Ely, —Richard Cox, Almoner to the King, —William May,—Rowland Taylor, of Hadleigh,— John Lucas,—Richard Goodrick,—and, lastly, Peter Martyr. Of these eight, Cranmer himself, Taylor, and P. Martyr, were the three persons most actively engaged. The work was, probably, first completed in English; and was then invested with its present garb of pure and classical Latinity by Sir John Cheke, and Dr. Haddon, the King's Professor of Civil Law at Cambridge[1]. It was distributed under fifty-one titles, as if in imitation of the Digest of Justinian: and an Appendix was added, *De Regulis Juris*, in correspondence with a similar addition to the Pandects. The whole of these intended laws ran in the name of the King, as an emphatic recognition of the Royal supremacy. But Edward unhappily expired without stamping the work with his authority; and thus the labours of the Primate were shed like water upon the earth. Nothing more was heard of the undertaking till 1571, when it was revived by the Puritani-

Commission for that purpose, to Cranmer and seven others.

Code compiled by them.

Edward dies without authorising it.

[1] Strype, Cranm. b. i. c. 30.

cal party in the House of Commons, with a view to its legislative enactment. But the jealousy of the Royal Lioness was aroused by the attempt, which encroached, as she imagined, upon her prerogative, as Head of the Church. She replied to the application by saying, that "she approved their good endeavours, but would not suffer these things to be ordered by Parliament." It was, however, published by Foxe, with the sanction of Archbishop Parker, under the title of *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum:* and in the same year, "a Book of certain Canons, concerning *some part* of the Discipline of the Church of England" was subscribed, in Convocation, by the Bishops, and printed first in English, and afterwards in Latin[1]. The *Reformatio Legum* was reprinted in 1640, in the reign of Charles I.; but no serious attempt was made for its revival. The last endeavour to bring it into notice was made by Bishop Burnet, in his lamentations over the decay of Church Discipline, at the conclusion of the History of his own Times. So that, from that hour to the present, the government of the Church of England has been carried on, partly by virtue of the canons adopted by the Convocation, in the time of Queen Elizabeth, and which are legally binding only on the Clergy,—and partly by the aid of such Acts of Parliament, as have been occasionally passed for particular objects and emergencies.

Published since, under the title Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum.

The failure of a design which cost Archbishop

[1] Strype, Cranm. b. i. c. 30.

Cranmer so much thought and labour, has been ascribed to various causes. By some, it has been attributed to the untimely deaths of Henry and of Edward[1]; by some to the intrigues of Papists, unable to endure the deliberate demolition of the Pontifical Code; and by others, again, it has been surmised that the severity of the Code itself armed against it the passions of a coarse and licentious age. In support of this last conjecture, a passage has been produced from a letter addressed to Bullinger, in Oct. 1552, by Dr. Cox, one of the eight Commissioners named above, in which the writer says,—"They have already altered the rites of the Public Prayers and Sacraments, and framed them according to the rules of God's word. *But we hate those bitter institutions of Christian Discipline.* We would be sons, yea, heirs; but we abhor the rod:" and he proceeds to implore of Bullinger that "he would, by his letters, stir up the great men and nobles, to take particular care of this discipline, without which,—with great grief he spake it,—the kingdom of God would be taken away from them[2]." Similar apprehensions had, before this time, been expressed by an English correspondent of Calvin's,—who declares it to be his persuasion that, unless the signal clemency of God should be extended to the King, the divine wrath would speedily be brought down upon his dominions by the unfaithful manner in which the work of the Lord was carried on. And

Probable causes of the failure of the project.

[1] Strype, Ecc. Mem. vol. ii. b. ii. c. 8. [2] Ib. c. 15.

among the fearful symptoms of the time, he reckons the impatience of all salutary discipline. He complains that multitudes encouraged themselves in dissoluteness of life, by licentious interpretation of Scripture, and by abuse of the Christian Sacraments: and he deplores the influence of certain pernicious teachers, who constantly affirmed, that it would be a vain and *fanatical attempt* to build up the Penitential Discipline of the Church,—that it would be intolerable to bind the sinner to Ecclesiastical Penance, and publicly to expose transgressions, involving open scandal, before Absolution should be granted to the delinquent. And hence,—he asserts,—the clearest denunciations of God's word were evaded, by such constructions of it as were dictated by worldly prudence or caprice, or even by downright hatred of those who taught a more holy and rigorous doctrine. And he, accordingly, adjures Calvin, most solemnly to admonish the Protector of the desolation and the treason which the Church of England was suffering from men, who neither knew Christ, nor sought to know him[1]. That the severity of the laws by which Cranmer endeavoured to remedy the evils of the time, was more than would be readily endured in an age like that which is here described, may fairly be admitted. That its penal enactments would, some of them, be altogether impracticable in our own days, is also beyond dispute. It is, nevertheless, quite cer-

[1] N. Calvino, Calv. Op. tom. ix. Ep. p. 59. Ed. Amst. 1667. This letter is dated from Cambridge, *die Pentecostes*. 1550.

tain, that, in one most essential particular, this remodelling of the Canon Law would have made an important step towards the modern principle of toleration. As this matter has not always been correctly understood, it may be advisable to consider it with peculiar attention.

It seems to be nearly agreed that, by the common law of the realm, heresy was a crime punishable with death: and, under the title of heresy was, of course, included,—not only the denial of all such doctrines as we now conceive to be peculiar to the Papal Church,—but all opinions which struck at the fundamental principles of the Christian verity[1]. It also appears that death by fire, whether legally or not, was occasionally resorted to in cases of heresy, even previously to the Statute of Henry IV., *de heretico comburendo*, by which the agonies of the stake were declared to be the appropriate penalty of all essential aberration from the Catholic faith[2]. It must, more-

[1] The Theodosian Code assigns the name of *Catholic Christians*, to those who "believe the Apostolic doctrine of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, of co-equal Majesty, one Deity, in Holy Trinity."—All others it stigmatizes as madmen and heretics: "Reliquos viros, dementes insanosque, judicantes hæretici dogmatis infamiam sustinere."—Cod. Theod. de Fide Cathol. Leg. 2.

[2] It appears that certain sectaries, by the name of *Albigenses*, were burned alive in the reign of John (Knighton, 2418); and that Swinderby, one of Wiclif's poor preachers, in the year 1389, was once in danger of being burned by the Mendicants, who had actually prepared dry wood for the purpose.—Foxe, vol. i. p. 530. Ed. 1684. Further, according to Bracton, an

over, be recollected, that in the reign of Edward VI., not only the act of the Six Articles, but all other persecuting statutes, were repealed: so that, at the time when the *Reformatio Legum* was compiled, the punishment of erroneous opinions in religion must have been left to the provisions of the Common Law; which made no distinction between notions utterly destructive of Christianity, and notions which only involved an heretical perversion of it. Now, it can be shewn, beyond all reasonable controversy, that this distinction was actually contemplated in the Reformed Code of Canon Law prepared by Archbishop Cranmer, and his associates. There is at present, in the British Museum, a manuscript copy of that very Code [1], containing several additions and corrections,

Intended mitigation of the punishment of heresy.

apostate Deacon was burned, in 1322, under Stephen Langton; and in 1347, two Franciscans suffered in the same manner, *quod de religione malè sentirent*. See Gl. Ridley's Review of Phillips's Life of Pole, p. 305. It has been thought by some, that the writ *de heretico comburendo* was as ancient as the Common Law itself: but even if this were so, it also appears that the conviction of the heretic was to be before the Archbishop himself, in Provincial Synod; and that the writ issued only by the special direction of the King in Council. Whereas the Statute of Henry IV. enabled the Diocesan alone to convict the offender; and compelled the sheriff to consign him to the fire, if he refused to abjure, without waiting for the consent of the Crown.—Blackst. vol. iv. p. 46, 47.

[1] Strype had seen the draft of the *Reformatio Leg. Eccles.* written out by Cranmer's Secretary, and corrected partly by Cranmer himself, partly (it has been conjectured) by Peter Martyr. And he says that there was a later and more perfect

which, if Cranmer had been spared to bring his work to a completion, would, doubtless, have been adopted in the authorized publication. In this copy, the first title relates to the Trinity and the Catholic Faith; and against all violation of essential doctrines, the penalty of death is there, undoubtedly, denounced. So far the spirit of intolerance appears to have undergone no mitigation. The second title relates to *Heresies:* and respecting the maintainer of heretical doctrine, the words of the code are, that, "after all efforts to reclaim him shall have been exhausted in vain, he shall be consigned to the civil magistrate, *to be punished.*" To this sentence, in the first instance, were added the words—"*with exile, or perpetual imprisonment:*" but the pen was subsequently struck through this brief addition, and a more full and precise form of enactment substituted for it, in

draft of it as completed in King Edward's reign, which afterwards fell into the hands of Archbishop Parker, from which the book was published in 1571, and again in 1640. He adds, that both these manuscripts were diligently compared by John Foxe; and that the main difference seemed to consist in putting the latter into a new method, and placing the titles differently.—Strype's Cranmer, b. i. c. 30. The MS. alluded to in the text, is in the Harl. Misc. 426, entitled, "The eleventh volume of Mr. John Foxe's papers, bought of Mr. Strype; which, also, Mr. Strype described in the following words: Reformatio legum Ecclesiasticarum ab Archiepiscopo Cantuar., aliisque selectis viris, composita." *This was Cranmer's own book; with his own hand, and Peter Martyr's, "in several places."* So that this must, probably, be the very draft, to which Strype himself alludes above.—See Todd's Cranmer, vol. ii. c. 13.

the following terms:—"either, that he may be driven into banishment for life, or thrust into the perpetual darkness of a prison,—or punished, at the discrètion of the magistrate, in any other way which may seem to be *most* expedient towards his conversion[1]."

This, then, in all human probability, is the form under which the new system of law *would* have come forth, had it ever received the sanction of the Crown; and, if so, there must be an end to the insinuations, which are sometimes heard, that Cranmer and his fellow-labourers were preparing, not for infidels and blasphemers, but for *heretics*, the fires in which they themselves were afterwards consumed. By the above clause, the denial of Christianity was to be visited with death, conformably to the rigour of the ancient law: but then, the ancient law was so far to be mitigated, that the chastisement of *heresy* was limited to exile, or confinement, or such other penalty as the magistrate might deem advisable; and this, always with a view to reclaim the offender from his errors. The spirit of a more humane age may, indeed, be abhorrent from *all* such forcible vindications of religion: but it cannot be denied that the change,

[1] The enactment, in Latin, was—"Consumptis omnibus remediis, ad extremum, ad civiles magistratus ablegetur *puniendus.*" The Latin words which, *at first*, followed *puniendus*, were, *exilio vel eterno carcere;* those which were substituted for them, are as follows—"vel ut in perpetuum pellatur exilium,—vel ad eternas carceris deprimatur tenebras,—vel, alioquin, magistratûs prudenti consideratione plectendus, *ut maximè illius conversioni expedire videbitur.*"—See Todd's Cranmer, vol ii. c. 13.

here intended, was at least an approximation to milder views of spiritual government.

That the Reformers were still familiar with the notion, that impiety was justly punishable with death, was, soon afterwards, remarkably exemplified by the approbation expressed by the gentle Melancthon, on the execution of Servetus [1]; whose crime was not simply that of heresy, but what was deemed a blasphemous assault upon the main doctrines of Christianity. Notions of nearly the same complexion (as we have recently, and most judiciously, been reminded [2],) were openly avowed, many years subsequently to the time of Cranmer, by Bishop Jewell, the great apologist of the Church of England; who had been himself a victim of persecution, and who matured his principles in exile at Frankfort. His language on the subject is as follows: "They that have a wicked opinion of God the Father, or of Christ, or of the Holy Ghost, or any other point of the Christian Religion, they being plainly confuted by the Gospel of Christ, I would plainly pronounce detestable and damned persons, and would defy them, even to the devil. Neither would I leave them so; but would also severely and straitly hold them in, by lawful and politic punishments, if they fortune to break out any where, and bewray themselves [3]." These, it

[1] See Ante, c. xi. vol. i. p. 337, 338.

[2] Blunt's Sketch of the Reformation, p. 313, 314.

[3] Jewell's Apology, p. iii. c. i. s. 3.

may be thought, are very bitter words. But yet, bitter as they are, they were echoed, a hundred years later, by the first and greatest champion of toleration. The author of "the Liberty of Prophesying" himself, sanctions, by manifest implication, the principle of Bishop Jewell: for he says, that "no Christian is to be *put to death* or dismembered, or otherwise directly persecuted, for his opinion, which does not teach blasphemy or impiety:" and again—"No matter of mere opinion, no errors that, of themselves, are not sins, are to be persecuted, or punished *with death*, or corporal inflictions [1]." It is but equitable that these examples should be kept in mind, when we are estimating the conduct and the views of Archbishop Cranmer. It is true that he was one of the Judges of Joan Bocher, and of Van Parre. It is also true, that he was the principal author of a set of Constitutions, which would have inflicted death upon the incorrigible enemies of revealed truth. But if these circumstances are to fix upon him the charge of persecution, most assuredly, the imputation must be shared with him, by such men as Melancthon, Jewell, and Jeremy Taylor.

Cranmer naturally disposed to mildness and moderation.

In addition to these observations, it may reasonably be conjectured that if the days of Cranmer had been prolonged, and his reformed Code had been submitted to the consideration of the Legislature, he would willingly

[1] Jer. Taylor, Lib. Proph. Sect. xiii. No. 1.—See also Sect. xv. No. 2.

and gladly have consented to a still further mitigation of its severities. His nature, like that of Melancthon, was, unquestionably, mild and gentle. When left to the exercise of his own discretion, his demeanour towards the most untractable adherents of the ancient faith was moderate, and even kind; and this to a degree which often brought upon him the displeasure and reprehension of men of hotter spirits[1]. An eminent instance of his clemency had occurred early in the present reign. The Vicar of Stepney was brought before him, in 1547, as a person notorious for his turbulent opposition to the reformation of the Church. But he was dismissed by the Archbishop with a gentle admonition and rebuke, much to the dissatisfaction of his Protestant accuser; who said, that if he had the Primate's authority, he would be bold enough to unvicar the delinquent, or, at all events, to administer such chastisement as should bring him to reason;—adding that, "if ever it should come to their turn, the Papists would show his Lordship no such favour."—"Well," said the Archbishop in reply, "if God so provide, we must even abide it."—"Surely," said the zealous man again, "God will con you no thanks for this, but rather will take the sword from such, as will not use it on his enemies." But all remonstrance was in vain. Cranmer was *stedfast and unmoveable* in his merciful resolution; and the informer was compelled to depart without any hope of seeing *justice* done upon the recusant[2]. Again,—it is related of

[1] Strype, Cranmer, b. iii. c. 30. [2] Ib. b. ii. c. 7.

him, by one who knew him well, that he incurred perpetual censure from his friends, for the almost dangerous indulgence of his demeanour towards the Papists; while the offending Protestants were treated by him with comparative severity. Against these imputations he uniformly vindicated himself, by alleging the words of our Saviour,—that the servant who knows the pleasure and commandment of his Lord, and yet disregards it, is worthy to be beaten with many stripes; while he who is but imperfectly acquainted with his Master's will, may, in all equity, be visited with milder chastisement[1]. Another instance of his moderation was seen in the counsel which he gave the King with regard to the Princess Mary, who persisted in her rejection of the Liturgy, and her use of the Mass. The conscience of Edward was sorely troubled by what appeared to him the obstinate and ungodly disobedience of his sister; and he referred the matter to the consideration of Cranmer, Ridley, and Ponet. They concurred in the reply that, although it was sinful to grant a positive licence to sin, yet circumstances might be such as to render connivance tolerable, provided that all practicable expedition were used in accomplishing what was right: and the result was, that after some continuance of the contest, the Princess was exempted from all further molestation[2]. It cannot, surely, be too much to presume, that a man like this,—cautious,

[1] Strype, Cranm. b. iii. c. 30, from Morice's Account.

[2] See Strype, Ecc. Mem. vol. ii. c. 1. Anno. 1551.

humane, averse from all extremity and violence,—would, every day he lived, have been brought more and more closely under the influences of an enlightened and charitable faith; and that his views of Christian discipline would have been gradually softened, as he drank deeper into the spirit of the true Christian doctrine.

The casualties which intercepted the design in question, had the effect of leaving the Church of England almost without any discipline at all: and this has been often made a subject of reproach against her, especially by the members of the Romish communion. The difficulty of maintaining any thing like an effectual discipline, in any great *national* Church whatever, has already been adverted to; and it is undeniable that, whatever may be the pretensions of the Papal Church in this respect, the same difficulty has always been felt by her, in a degree immeasurably greater than she will ever be willing to confess. A discipline, indeed, she has, which keeps her people in a state of superstitious thraldom to the Priesthood; but the very secret of that discipline lies in the skilful and indulgent adaptation of the system to the vices and frailties of our corrupt nature. It is a discipline which has often, doubtless, been exercised with beneficial effects; but which, if surveyed throughout the whole history of its operation, has tended to establish, not so much the dominion of holy and virtuous principle, as the power and influence of the sacred class. And even this operation has been weakened,—(and

Considerations on the want of Discipline in our Church.

that to a degree which has frequently disfigured her boasted unity with many an unseemly rent),—partly by the strife for mastery between the secular ministers, and their more crafty brethren of the monastic institutions;—and partly by the spirit of dissension, prevalent among the rival orders of the regular Clergy. In a Christian society, constructed according to the principles of the Reformation, the obstacles in the way of Ecclesiastical government, must, of course, be still more numerous and more unmanageable. When Reason has once been solemnly appealed to, it becomes an arduous matter indeed to bend a stiff-necked and gainsaying people to the yoke of spiritual authority! The right of *private judgment* is one which is apt to be interpreted with a most pernicious latitude: and the natural consequence is, that a Protestant community is liable to be subdivided into an endless multitude of sects; acknowledging, in their hearts, no centre of union, and destitute of all deep regard for the integrity of the Church. The censures pronounced by the Minister of a Communion, which lays no claim to infallibility or exclusive salvation, soon begin to lose their terror, and consequently their effect. They are submitted to, much in the same temper that men submit to the sentences of mere secular judicatures. They are inflicted, indeed, "for the health of the offender's soul;" but they, at last, are apt to be felt only as penalties which affect his worldly interests. The distinction between the temporal and the spiritual jurisdiction becomes gradually fainter, as the number of separate religious commu-

nities is multiplied; till, at length, the Episcopal Courts are *practically* confounded with the ordinary tribunals of the land. And when the principles of Toleration are generally recognized by the people and the Legislature, the case becomes more difficult than ever: for what can be the *moral* effect of a judicial sentence, pronounced in the name of a Bishop, upon a conscience which has been so far *enlightened* as to reject Episcopal authority?—Or, how can the national Church's Excommunication be supposed to afflict or dismay the soul, which has, perhaps, already exercised the right to separate itself from all communion with the Church,—and this, without any supposed forfeiture of Christian privileges? These are remarks which must force themselves on the mind of every one, who attentively surveys the state of Christianity in this kingdom, at the present day. And they are offered, not with a view to discourage all judicious attempts at the establishment of a stricter discipline,—but chiefly for the purpose of showing that, even if Cranmer's Reformation of the Spiritual Code had been adopted, it must, subsequently, have undergone considerable modifications, or else must have become, in some respects, wholly inapplicable to the modern frame of society in England [1].

[1] It may here be properly suggested that, not only the Clergy, but also the Laity who are sincerely attached to the Church of their fathers, have it in their power to do something towards the supply of the deficiency, occasioned by the want of a more complete and imperative system of Canon Law. "If," says Mr. Blunt, very truly, "Discipline, properly so called, be lacking,

State of opinions and morals during the progress of the Reformation.

In order to enter fully into the views of those who were anxious for the establishment of a vigorous scheme of spiritual discipline, it is quite necessary that we should, as it were, throw ourselves back into the very midst of those troublous times. In the first place, it should be observed, that the Protestant Reformation had, as yet, brought with it nothing like an habitual and general respect for the rights of conscience. It was no part of what was called the "New Learning," that individuals might form their own Creeds at will; and that independent Religious Societies might plant themselves upon foundations distinct from those on which the national Establishment was reared. According to the theory of those days, every Englishman was, by birth, a member of the Church of England; and could by no means remove himself from her communion, without clearly incurring the guilt both of schism and disloyalty. A man could then no more throw off his allegiance to the Church, than he could throw off his

so much the rather should those Ecclesiastical regulations, which are of imperfect obligation, perhaps,—(and there are many such) —be diligently observed by the Clergy, both towards those set over them, and towards those committed to their charge; the respect or neglect of which, is just that which constitutes the decency or disorder of a Church,—a distinction not easy to describe in detail, yet sufficiently intelligible in itself. Nor is it unreasonable to expect that the Laity, on their part, should see the advantage of such rules, which cannot be onerous; and cordially co-operate with the Clergy to the maintenance of them." Sketch of the Reform. pp. 315, 316.

allegiance to the State. The King was, in the most commanding sense, the Head of the Church. Every attempt, therefore, at separation or dissent, was stamped, more or less deeply, with the character of sedition,—we might almost say, of treason; and for this, among other causes, it was, that the Council were incessantly on the watch against the appearance of every new sect. The cases of Joan of Kent, and Van Parre have already been noticed. Another instance of their vigilance in such matters, occurred in the course of 1552. In the September of that year a letter was dispatched by them to the Archbishop, requiring him to examine a body of sectaries which had recently sprung up in Kent, and to take immediate measures for its suppression. The denomination of these religionists has not been preserved; but it has been conjectured that they were no other than those, which were, afterwards, well known by the name of the Family of Love, and which in time became powerful enough seriously to aggravate the evils of religious discord. If this conjecture be true, the class in question must, naturally enough, have awakened the jealousy of the government: for, in the first place, their notions were strongly tainted with absurdity and blasphemy[1]; and, moreover, they

[1] Among their religious notions were the following:—"that Christ doth not signify any one person, but a quality, whereof many are partakers; that to be raised, is nothing else but to be regenerated, or endued with the same quality; and that, when separation of them which have it, from them which have it not, is here made, this is judgment."—Hooker, vol. i. Pref. p.147. Ox. Ed.

seemed to exact of their followers a defection from almost every known form of Christianity. This will appear from the following directions to those who would embrace their party: "They must pass four terrible *castles*, full of cumbersome enemies, before they come to the House of Love. The *first* is of John Calvin—the second, of the Papists—the third, Martin Luther—the fourth, the Anabaptists. And, passing these dangers, they may be of the Family, else not." It is easy to perceive that a *family*, which had emerged from these various perils, might, in all probability, soon have a *castle* of their own, which would frown defiance upon the battlements of established authority [1]: and they were, accordingly, consigned to the inquisition of the Primate. What were the measures resorted to by him for their restraint, we are not informed: but it will readily be understood that an age so fruitful in mongrel varieties

[1] A copious exposition of the extravagancies of the Familists may be found in Henry More's Mystery of Godliness, b. vi. c. 16, 17, 18, 19. The sect was considered by More, even in his time, as exceedingly dangerous. He says, "it may prove a Pandora's box to mankind, even in this life, if a more benign Providence do not prevent it." One of its promises was, that Familism should thrust Christianity out of the world. And, "although its writings were so thick painted with the sweet repetition of *Love* and *Lovely*, the issue of such a victory would be the most beastly tyranny that ever yet appeared on the stage of the earth; worse, by far, than Mahometism itself."—Ib. c. 18. It seems to have combined all the worst evils of Mysticism and Antinomianism. The recent sect of the St. Simonians, is, perhaps, only another *Avatàr* of the Spirit of Familism.

of religion, and, as yet, unprepared for a full recognition of the freedom of conscience, would seem urgently to demand some effective code of Ecclesiastical Institutions[1].

Another reason for Cranmer's anxiety to accomplish this object, may be discerned in the overflowing iniquity and licentiousness of the times, which, as we have seen, had raised a bitter outcry, even among the friends of the Reformation. It is possible, indeed, that the representations left us of the profligacy of that age, may have been somewhat overcharged by the increased keenness of moral sensibility which the Reformation brought with it[2]. But still, the predominance of disorder and vice must have been extremely fearful, to extort the following complaints from a Chaplain of Archbishop Cranmer[3]: "What a number of false Christians live there at this present day, unto the exceeding dishonour of the Christian profession, which, with their mouth, confess that they know God, but with their deeds utterly deny him, and are abominable, disobedient to the word of God, and utterly estranged from all good works? What a swarm of *gross gospellers* have we also among us, which can prattle of the Gospel very finely, talk much of the justification of faith, crack very stoutly of the free remission of their sins by Christ's blood, and advance themselves to be of the

[1] See Strype's Cranmer, b. ii. c. 33. Todd's Cranmer, vol. ii. c. 14.

[2] Strype's Eccl. Mem. b. ii. c. 23.

[3] Thomas Becon. See Strype's Cranmer, b. ii. c. 33.

number of those who are predestinate unto glory[1]? But how far do their lives differ from all true Christianity? They are puffed up with all kind of pride. They swell with all kind of envy, malice, hatred, and enmity against their neighbour. They burn with unquenchable lust of carnal concupiscence. They wallow and tumble in all kinds of beastly pleasure. Their greedy covetous affections are insatiable. The enlarging of their lordships, the encreasing of their substances, the scraping together of their worldly possessions, are infinite, and know no end. In fine, all their endeavours tend unto this end—to shew themselves very ethnics (heathens), and utterly estranged from God in their conversation, although, in words, they otherwise pretend. As for their alms-deeds, their praying, their watching, their fasting, and such other godly exercises of the spirit, they are utterly banished from these rude and gross gospellers. All their religion consisteth in words and disputations; in Christian acts, and godly deeds—nothing at all[2]!"—We have here a picture of the national manners, executed by the hand of a Reformer—a picture which a Romanist might contemplate with secret exultation—a picture which must have desolated the heart of all who had been labouring to renovate and purify the Church: and must, naturally,

[1] These, be it remembered, are the words of a Chaplain of Cranmer's: and, assuredly, they do not indicate that the Archbishop was a patron of Calvinistic principles.

[2] See also much to the same purpose, in Latimer's Sermons,—we might almost say *passim*.

have stirred their spirits within them, and prompted them to draw forth the spiritual sword from its scabbard, and to send it through the land, for the extirpation of the mischief. The Papist was incessantly taunting them with the abortion of their labours. Their Church, he told them, was the creature of the Parliament—merely a political creation—and destitute of those salutary terrors which belong to a truly spiritual institution. It cannot, therefore, be wonderful that the Primate and his auxiliaries should be impatient to silence these reproaches; and to give the Church a discipline, which should make it formidable to those who should use their new-born liberty for a cloak of all maliciousness.

Commission to Cranmer and several Gentlemen to recover embezzled property, lately belonging to the Chantries, &c.

The Archbishop was in Kent, at his house at Ford, near Canterbury, when he was called upon to examine the Sectarians above described: and, nearly at the same period, he was occupied about another vexatious matter. It will be recollected that, in the present reign, certain chantries, and other religious houses, had been formally vested in the Crown, by Act of Parliament. This measure was, *of course*, a signal for embezzlement and pillage. The plate and goods belonging to these establishments disappeared, as if by magic; and a commission was issued, in this year, to the Archbishop, and several gentlemen of Kent, devolving on them the office of recovering the spoil, on the King's behalf. The Primate was, at all times, ready to exert himself for the advantage and honour of his

Sovereign; but he was by no means proud of the function of agent, or Attorney-General, to the Duke of Northumberland: and, consequently, he was not found to be particularly active in expediting the ungracious business now committed to his charge. He was perfectly well aware that, whatever he might succeed in rescuing from the gripe of the plunderer, would never find its way into the Royal Treasury; but would only help to fill the coffers of the rapacious and unprincipled Protector and his creatures. His tardiness in the matter, however, exposed him to the imputation of negligence in forwarding the interests of the King: and he was under the necessity of rendering some explanation of his want of promptitude. For this purpose he addressed a letter to the Duke; as may be collected from the account he gives of it to the sagacious Cecil, to whose friendly suggestions he was probably indebted on this occasion. His words are—"I have written letters to my Lord of Northumberland, declaring unto him the cause of my stay in the commission; which is, because all the gentlemen that be in the commission with me, be now in London: before whose coming home, if I should proceed without them, I might perchance travail in vain, and take more pain than I should do good [1]." The incident, in itself, is of no great importance: but it illustrates the position of the Arch-

Reasons for his unwillingness to act.

[1] Strype's Cranmer, b. ii. c. 33. and App. No. 107. The date of the letter to Cecil, is the 20th Nov. 1552.

bishop, placed as he was in the midst of worldly-minded men, and expected to prostitute his high authority to the furtherance of their sordid and profligate designs.

1553.

Northumberland's project for altering the Succession.

We now approach the last occurrence, of any moment, in which Cranmer was concerned during the life of Edward. The flagitious intrigue by which Northumberland attempted to seat his own connexions on the throne, belongs to general history; and, of course, will require no minute exposition in a work like this. The outline of the project is well known to every one who has looked into our national annals. The constitution of King Edward was, unfortunately, delicate. He had long been labouring under symptoms of gradual decline. The next in succession was the Princess Mary,—an austere and bigotted Roman Catholic. The Duke of Northumberland had married his fourth son, Lord Guildford Dudley, to the Lady Jane Grey, daughter of the Duke of Suffolk, and grand-daughter to Mary, the sister of Henry VIII. The Lady Jane is described by all historians as admirable for every feminine excellence, and every mental accomplishment; and she was, further, like her husband, educated strictly in the Protestant faith. The Protector himself, if he had "any other religion than interest," was all this while supposed to have been, in his heart, a Papist; though he did not make an open profession of the Romish belief till the moment when he was brought to the scaffold. But, be this as it may, his object in

selecting for his son a Protestant bride of the Royal blood, was now plainly developed. He plied the sensitive conscience of his dying Sovereign, with urgent representations of the danger to which the Church would inevitably be exposed, by the succession of his sister Mary to the throne of England. It was true, he said, that better hopes might be entertained of the Princess Elizabeth; but her sentiments were, at best, but uncertain; and, besides, both sisters having been left under the Parliamentary stigma of illegitimacy, it would be impossible to leave the succession open to the one, and to close it against the other. Nothing, therefore, remained but to set them both aside, and to deviate slightly from the regular lineage, in favour of persons, the soundness of whose faith was beyond all dispute. The country would thus be preserved from the dangers of foreign subjugation, and domestic persecution; and both the glory of God, and the safety of the realm, would be effectually consulted, at a small sacrifice of merely conventional and artificial right[1].

The alarm of Edward for the Protestant cause must have been intense,—or, he must have been under the influence of positive infatuation. Nothing else could have opened his ears to such reasoning as this, from

[1] It is a remarkable circumstance, that other Roman Catholic Lords, besides Northumberland, were parties to this scheme: and this has led Mr. Turner to the surmise, that the project was not taken up so much with a view to the aggrandizement of the Dudleys, as to the reinstatement of the Aristocracy in the supreme influence in the state. Turner. Edw. VI. p. 334.

the mouth of an ambitious man, who was father-in-law to the proposed Queen! In vain did the Judges remonstrate, for a time, against this dangerous enterprize. The Council was inflexible; and the remaining scruples of the Sages of the Law were overpowered with the assurance, that the sanction of the Legislature would be obtained for the projected settlement. Even the signature of the cautious and prudent Cecil was affixed to the fatal document; though, with his usual dexterity and address, he always protested that his name appeared there merely in the way of official countersign, and not as an indication of his personal share in the enterprise. The only individual that yet held out was Archbishop Cranmer. Anxious as he was for the security of the Reformed Church, he peremptorily refused to concur in a measure, framed in direct violation of the law, and in manifest contradiction to the will of his late master. These sentiments he would have uttered to the King in privacy. But this privilege was shamefully denied him. He was not allowed the advantage of a confidential interview with his Sovereign: and not only so, but he was insolently rebuked, in the presence of the Council, for daring to come between the Sovereign and his settled purpose. He was, however, at last so sorely beset by Edward himself, that, in spite of his better judgment, he too was prevailed upon to yield. He was unable to resist the urgency of the Royal youth, whom from his heart he had always loved and honoured; and thus he, unhappily, became party to a

Cranmer's share in it considered.

deed, which he soon had reason most bitterly to repent.

The process by which he was driven from the stedfastness of his original purpose, may be best learned from himself. The following is the account of the matter subsequently addressed by him to the Queen :—" I am now constrained, most lamentably, and with most penitent and sorrowful heart, to ask mercy and pardon for my heinous folly and offence, in consenting and following the testament and last will of our late Sovereign Lord King Edward VI., your Grace's brother; which, well God he knoweth, I never liked; nor any thing grieved me so much that your Grace's brother did. And if, by any means, it had been in me to have letted the making of that will, I would have done it. And what I said therein, as well to the Council as to himself, divers of your Majesty's Council can report; but none so well as the Marquess of Northampton, and the Lord Darcy, then Lord Chamberlain to the King's Majesty, which two were present at the communication between the King's Majesty and me. I desired to talk with the King's Majesty alone; but I could not be suffered, and so I failed of my purpose. For if I might have communed with the King alone, and at good leisure, my trust was, that I should have altered him from his purpose: but they being present, my labour was in vain. Then, when I could not dissuade him from the said will, and both he and his Privy Council also informed me that the Judges, and his learned Counsel, said that the Act of entailing the Crown, made by his

father, could not be prejudicial to him,—but that he, being in possession of the Crown, might make his will thereof,—this seemed very strange to me! But, *being the sentence of the Judges, and other his learned Counsel* in the laws of this realm,—(as both he and his Council informed me)—me thought it became me not, being unlearned in the law, to stand against my Prince therein. And so, at length, I was required by the King's Majesty himself to set my hand to his will,—saying, that he trusted I alone would not be more repugnant to his will, than the rest of the Council were. Which words surely grieved my heart very sore: and so I granted him to subscribe the will, and to follow the same: which when I had set my hand unto, I did it unfeignedly, and without dissimulation. For the which I submit myself most humbly to your Majesty, acknowledging mine offençe with most grievous and sorrowful heart, and beseeching your mercy and pardon: which, my heart giveth me, shall not be denied unto me, being granted before to so many, which travailed not so much to dissuade both the King and his Council, as I did[1]." Besides this letter to the Queen, an application was subsequently made by Cranmer to the Lords of the Council, for their good offices with her Majesty in his behalf, after he had undergone his Disputation at Oxford; and, in this address he appeals to their own

[1] Strype, Cranm. App. No. 74. Cranmer's Remains, vol. i. p. 360. Lett. 295.

knowledge of the extreme reluctance with which he yielded to the solicitations of the King. "Some of you," he says, "know by what means I was brought and trained [drawn] unto the will of our late Sovereign Lord, King Edward VI., and what I spake against the same; wherein I refer me to the reports of your Honours and Worships[1]."

It has sometimes been imagined, that the firmness of Cranmer on this occasion was trampled down by the violence of Northumberland, or shaken by his artifices. That this notion is erroneous, is proved by the testimony of the Archbishop himself: for he continues his letter to the Queen in the following words: "And, whereas it is contained in two Acts of Parliament, as I understand, that I, with the Duke of Northumberland, should devise and compass the deprivation of your Majesty,—*surely it is untrue.* For the Duke never opened his mouth to me, to move me to any such matter. Nor his heart was not such towards me—(seeking long time my destruction)—that he would ever trust me in such a matter, or think I would be persuaded by him. It was the other of the Council that moved me, and the King himself, the Duke of Northumberland not being present. Neither before, nor after, had I ever any privy communication with the Duke of that matter,—saving that *openly*,

[1] This Letter to the Council is the Letters of the Martyrs, fol. 16; and in Strype, Cranm. Append. No. 97. Also in Cranmer's Remains, vol. i. p. 365. Lett. 297.

at the council table, the Duke said unto me that it became me not to say to the King, as I did, when I went about to dissuade him from his said will[1]."

From the above statements[2], it is evident that, of all the members of the Council, Roman Catholic or Protestant, who were implicated in this project, Cranmer was, beyond comparison, the most entitled to indulgence. His fault was without the aggravation of any sinister or unworthy motive. His resistance to the scheme was more stubborn and protracted than that of any other individual engaged in it. He was the very last to consent: and even then, he did not surrender his own judgment, until he found that it placed him in opposition to the unanimous resolution of the rest of the Council,—to the alleged opinion of the Judges of the land, and the legal advisers of the Crown,—and lastly, to the dying importunities of the King, whom he loved with all the affection of a father. Nothing, in short, was wanting to keep him wholly blameless, but greater strength of purpose, and deeper confidence in his own judgment.

[1] Strype, Cranm. Append. No. 74.

[2] That is,—says Dr. Lingard,—*if these statements are to be believed!* (Hist. Engl. vol. vii. p. 140.) I am unable to comprehend why the solemn averments of Archbishop Cranmer should be put aside by three words of sarcastic insinuation. Besides,—even if the Archbishop could hope to impose upon his Sovereign by a deliberate falsehood,—is it credible that he could have been so infatuated, as to appeal to the Marquis of Northampton,—to the Lord Chamberlain,—to the whole Council,—to avouch an unfounded story, when a single word of theirs must have convicted him of untruth, and covered him with infamy.

The Death of Edward VI.

The days of Edward drew speedily to a close; and, according to the manner of those barbarous times, suspicions of poison were soon whispered abroad[1]. There is, however, no reasonable cause for believing that his death was hastened a single hour by violence of any sort, unless we except that which may have been ignorantly and stupidly inflicted by the *wise woman*, who was called in to the Royal patient, when all other human aid seemed hopeless. The constitution of the King had a tendency to pulmonary consumption: and when the symptoms of that disorder become alarming, they naturally called forth those expressions of anxiety, which appear occasionally in the correspondence of the Archbishop[2], but which furnish no evidence of his apprehension that foul practices were on foot against the life of Edward. That he came to no unnatural end is rendered almost certain, by the following extract from a letter of the Council to Sir Philip Hoby, the Ambassador to the Emperor, announcing the King's decease:—"We must tell you a great heap of infelicity. God hath called out of this world our Sovereign Lord, the sixth of this month (July, 1553,) towards night, whose manner of death was such towards God, as assureth us that his soul is in place of eternal joy. The disease whereof he died

[1] It is roundly asserted by a Biographer of Pole, that Edward was taken off by Northumberland: "In Anglia, malis Ducis Northumbriæ artibus, extincto Edvardo."—Dudith, p. 43. Ed. 1690.

[2] Strype, Cranm. b. ii. c. 29. Cranmer's Works, vol. i. p. 354.

was putrefaction of the lungs, being utterly incurable [1]."

The last prayer of Edward was, that "God would defend the realm from *Papistry*." Had his life been spared, and the rest of his days been answerable to their beginning, there is some reason to believe, that the land would have been less in danger of *Papistry* than of Puritanism; or, at least, that the temporal resources of the Protestant Church might have gone into utter dilapidation. His brief course on earth was, however, blameless, and almost saintly; and without retailing the prodigal encomiums with which the Protestant writers have embalmed his memory, we may surely venture to describe him as a blessed instrument, in the hands of a gracious Providence, for the consolidation of the Reformed faith in the realm of England.

Sorrowful presentiments of the Reformers.

His departure was the last of a long catalogue of dismal signs, which, for some time past, had been saddening the spirits of the Reformers, though without, for a moment, relaxing their exertions, or abating their courage. "The learned and pious sort," said Becon, when in exile, "in King Edward's time, did reckon on a great calamity impending over their heads;" and they often poured out these forebodings in the ears of their congregations. One circumstance of fearful augury, in their sight, was the general depravity of manners,—which oppressed their hearts

[1] Cott. MSS. Galba. b. xii. 249. b.; cited in Todd's Cranmer, vol. ii. p. 363.

with deeper despondence, when contrasted with the high standard of virtue and godliness, which they were incessantly holding up to the contemplation of their people. Another cause of dejection was, the loss of several mighty standard-bearers of the faith,—the Protector Somerset,—the Duke of Suffolk and his brother,—and, more particularly, the death of Paulus Fagius and of Martin Bucer, whose untimely removal from their labours was, alone, regarded as a sure prognostic of disaster to the pure faith of the Gospel[1]. The adamantine heart of John Knox himself was gloomily invaded by these presentiments of evil. From his banishment, he afterwards wrote to establish the hearts of the faithful, then under persecution: and he reminded them, that he had often predicted those calamities, not only to his own people, but before the face of Northumberland,—and again, in the presence of the King himself,—and, lastly, in the midst of the banqueting, and the riot, and the festive fires, which proclaimed the accession of the Popish Queen[2]. The day, therefore, which closed the eyes of the youthful Josias,—"that perfect and lovely mirror of true nobility and sincere godliness[3],"—was to them, in truth, a day of *gloominess and rebuke*. The time was fast approaching, when they, and their venerable Primate, were to be called to a merciless account. The people were speedily to witness,—not here and there the solitary fires that marked the sacrifice of some unhappy and fanatical misbeliever,—but scenes

[1] Strype, Cranm. b. iii. c. 2. [2] Ib. c. 15. [3] Ib. c. 2.

which might almost recall the horrors of the ancient Druidism. It was the inscrutable will of Providence, that the old Superstition should be *loosed for a season*,—in order that it might make itself hateful in the sight of men and angels; and that its savour might be abhorred in the nostrils of a people, who had tasted the blessings of a system comparatively righteous and humane. The Archbishop and his friends must have foreseen that, sooner or later, the furnace would be heated for themselves, with seven-fold fury. How wonderfully the noble army of our Martyrs were supported under their torments, has been amply and faithfully recorded by their unwearied chronicler. A short eclipse, it is true, was permitted to pass over the brightness of their great leader's integrity. But, at the last, it emerged with a splendour which no lapse of time shall ever be able to efface.

CHAPTER XV.

1553—1554.

Failure of Northumberland's design—First Proceedings of Queen Mary—Cranmer committed to the Tower—Cause of his Committal—His declaration concerning the Mass—He refuses to fly—Act for confirming the Marriage of Henry with Catharine—Cranmer attainted of High Treason—Removed to Oxford with Latimer and Ridley—Their Disputations at Oxford—Letter of Rowland Taylor to Cranmer, &c.—All three Condemned—The other Protestants decline disputation, but offer to answer before the Council or Parliament—Cranmer, &c. reserved for another trial, when the Pope's authority should be revived—But still detained in Prison—Revival of the persecuting Statutes—Courage of the Reformers—Cranmer's request to "utter his mind" to the Queen respecting Religion.

Failure of Northumberland's design.

THE brief reign of the reluctant and amiable usurper, Lady Jane Grey, together with its tragical termination, fall within the province of the general historians of our country. We must confine ourselves to the notice of those incidents, which are more immediately connected with the biography of the Archbishop. On the 9th of July allegiance was sworn to Jane, by the great Officers of State; and immediately after, in reply to a communication from Mary to the

Council, asserting her pretensions to the throne,—an answer, or manifesto, was issued by them, reminding her of her illegitimacy, and charging her to desist from her opposition to the lawful Sovereign; and to this document the name of the Primate was, undoubtedly, affixed. It further appears that the Courtiers remained firm to the Lady Jane, till the 19th of July: for, on that day Cranmer, together with the other members of the Council assembled in the Tower, addressed a mandate to Lord Rich, the Lord Lieutenant of the county of Essex, exhorting and requiring him to remain true and faithful to the cause[1]. On the very following day, however, the tide of allegiance began suddenly to ebb away. Several of the very same men, who on the 19th had stoutly summoned her subjects to her defence, on the 20th were suddenly impatient to send in their submissions to Mary. This capitulation was endorsed by Cecil; and, in excusing their defection from the Queen, it distinctly alleges that the parties to the document were "prevented from uttering their determination before, without great destruction and bloodshed of themselves and others[2]." On the same day, too, they despatched an order to the Duke of Northumberland, requiring him to disarm without delay; which order was also signed by the Archbishop[3]. From this moment the plot of the Protector was no better than a heap of

[1] Strype's Cranmer, App. No. 69.

[2] Ibid. App. No. 71.—The names of those who signed this paper are not given by Strype.

[3] Strype, b. iii. c. i.

ruins. The fabric which he had been building up through the whole of his ambitious life was, in an instant, in fragments at his feet: and so sensible was he of this, that when the Queen was proclaimed at Cambridge, he was among the first to throw up his cap, and to cry out "God save Queen Mary[1]." But his tardy and hypocritical loyalty was unable to save him from the axe: and, unhappily, his blameless and exemplary daughter-in-law was involved in the destiny, which ought to have been reserved solely for the arch-tempters, with whom she was unhappily surrounded.

It is not, perhaps, so difficult as it may on first sight appear, to account for the suddenness of this counter-revolution. The daughters of Henry VIII., it is true, had both of them been stamped by the legislature with the brand of illegitimacy. But the people must, all along, have felt that this was an arbitrary and capricious doom: and they all knew that it had been, virtually, annulled by the last will of their favourite stout-hearted monarch, which to them, probably, stood in the place of law. And then, too, the prejudices of the Roman Catholics and the principles of the Reformed, conspired to restore the succession to its natural course. The sincere Romanists were justifiably anxious to see the throne occupied by a Princess of their own persuasion. The Protestants were impelled, by their own religious views, to maintain submission to what was deemed

[1] Godw. Ann. 1553. Engl. Transl. p. 160. Ed. 1675.

lawful authority, and to defeat all projects which savoured of usurpation; and both Romanists and Protestants were animated by a common sentiment of detestation for the profligate designs of the Protector. When these circumstances are duly estimated, it will appear far from wonderful that the accession of the daughter of Catharine of Arragon should be celebrated, as it was, with festivities and bonfires, in spite of her notorious devotion to the pretensions of the Pope. There is something in the spectacle which, on the whole, may be considered as indicating the stability of the social fabric in our country;—something which proclaims that the people of England are not *easily* enamoured of political vicissitudes. In a country more pervaded by the elements of Revolution, and equally distracted between conflicting creeds, the rival pretensions of a Protestant and a Romish Queen might have been productive of a desperate and sanguinary civil war[1].

[1] "The English," says Godwyn, "are in their due respects to their Prince so loyally constant, that no regards—no, not the pretext of religion—can alienate their affections from their lawful Sovereign; whereof this miserable case of Lady Jane will give a memorable example. For, although her faction had laid a strong foundation, and had most artificially raised their superstructure,—yet, as soon as the true and undoubted heir did but manifest her resolution to vindicate her right,—this accurate pile presently fell, as it were in the twinkling of an eye; and that, chiefly by their endeavour, of whom, for their religion's sake, Lady Jane might have presumed herself assured."—Godw. Ann. 1553. Engl. Transl. p. 157. Ed. 1675.

First Proceedings of Queen Mary.

Some doubts have been entertained respecting the question, whether Mary ever promised a system of toleration to the men of Suffolk. The inhabitants of that county, it should be remembered, were more deeply and generally possessed by the principles of the Reformation than those of any other district in the kingdom: and yet they were foremost in their loyalty to the Popish Princess, whom they regarded as their legitimate Sovereign. That their allegiance was bribed by any declaration, amounting to a pledge of indulgence towards the Protestant faith, has been so much a matter of controversy, that it can scarcely be safe to assume it as a fact. On the other hand, it seems to be absolutely certain that a promise to this effect was, in the first instance, held out to the city of London: for, on the 12th of August, Mary declared to them that "she meaned, graciously, not to compel, or strain, other men's consciences, otherwise than as God should, as she trusted, put into their hearts a persuasion of the truth, through *the opening his word unto them.*" The manner in which the "word was to be opened," and the consciences of her subjects enlightened to receive the truth, speedily became apparent. A very clear indication of the intended process, was made in a proclamation which followed on the 18th of the same month, in which she repeated her indulgent declaration, with the reserve, that it was to be continued "until such time as further order, by common consent, may be taken

therein [1]." The text here promulgated was soon attended by a practical and very intelligible commentary, in the release and restoration of Gardiner, Tonstal, Boner, Hethe, and Day: in the advancement of the Bishop of Winchester to the dignity of Chancellor; and in the issuing of a commission for licensing, *under the Great Seal*, such preachers only as, in his estimation, should be of sufficient gravity and discretion to be entrusted with the office. This order for silencing the Reformed Clergy, it will be observed, was a more arbitrary exercise of the Royal Supremacy, than had ever been resorted to in the course of the preceding reign; for it excluded the Primate from all share in the selection of preachers, and consigned the matter wholly to the judgment of the Chancellor. A still more formidable intimation of the designs of the Court, was the issuing of a Commission to the Bishops of London, Winchester, Chichester, and Durham, (men, whose tempers were not likely to be much sweetened by the treatment they had experienced in the former reign,) authorizing them to degrade and imprison the Protestant Clergy, both Ministers and Prelates, on the threefold charge of treason, heresy, and matrimony. Of course it was not to be expected that Cranmer would remain long unmolested, after the Queen was firmly seated in her throne. Early in the month of August, he was summoned before the Council, doubtless to answer for his participation in the late treasonable attempt;

[1] Wilk. Conc. vol. iv. p. 86.

and was immediately ordered to confine himself to Lambeth. He was brought before them again on the 27th of the same month; and commanded to bring with him an inventory of his goods. What may have been the intention of the Court towards him, at this moment, it may not be very easy to pronounce. Their proceedings, however, soon wore an aspect of more decided severity: for about the middle of the following September, he was committed to the Tower. The order for his committal was issued by men who were as deeply involved in political delinquency as himself; and who yet had the effrontery to state, as the reason for his imprisonment, that it was "thought convenient—as well for the treason committed by him against the Queen's Majesty, as for aggravating that offence, by spreading about seditious bills, moving tumults to the disquieting *the present state*,"—that he should remain in custody, till he should be "referred to justice, or further ordered, as should stand with the Queen's pleasure."

Crahmer committed to the Tower, September, 1553.

Causes of his Committal.

By the "*present state*," the counsellors must probably have meant the *state* of things which then existed in the mind and contemplation of Mary and her Roman Catholic advisers: for no other "*state*" than this, most certainly, could be affected by any proceedings of Cranmer. So far, at least, as Religion was concerned, the circumstances which involved him in the charge of tumult and sedition, had been of a directly opposite tendency; for they were, precisely, such as indicated

a resolution to maintain things in the very condition in which they were left by Edward VI,, and which, as yet, had not been revoked by any legal enactment. The incidents, to which the Council had above alluded, were as follow. The obsequies of the late King were celebrated in English, at Westminster Abbey, and the Sacrament administered according to the ritual of King Edward; while a solemn Dirge and High Mass, in Latin, were chanted for him in the chapel of the Tower. That the Archbishop was concerned in either of these solemnities, is utterly destitute of proof. With the *Dirge* and *Requiem* he assuredly had no concern; and, according to Godwyn[1], Day, the Bishop of Chichester, (who had been imprisoned in the last reign) was the person who officiated at the funeral service in English. It was, nevertheless, reported that Cranmer had professed his readiness to officiate in the Latin service; and,—what was still more outrageously false,—that he had actually restored the celebration of the Mass in his own Cathedral. These calumnies were too much, even for the habitual equanimity of the Archbishop. While he was under restraint at Lambeth, he drew up a Declaration, conceived in language much more intemperate than was usual with him, the object of which was, to repel this shameful mis-statement. It is true, that the Mass had been solemnized in Canterbury Cathedral; but the person who officiated on the oc-

His Declaration concerning the Mass.

[1] Annals, 1553. Engl. Transl. p. 162. Ed. 1675.

casion was, not the Primate, but Thornden, the Suffragan of Dover, and Vice-Dean of Canterbury; the ungrateful and perfidious Monk who had been always treated by Cranmer as his own familiar friend; who had received from him, on many occasions, distinguished marks of respect and honour[1]; who, nevertheless, in the reign of Henry VIII., had joined in a conspiracy for the ruin of his patron; and who now had the audacity, without consulting the Archbishop, to make his metropolitan church the scene of open defection from the cause of the Reformation. It is by no means wonderful that the insolence and treachery of this man should betray the Archbishop into unusual commotion of spirit. He was not con-

[1] Wharton's Observations, &c. Strype, Cranm. App. p. 258, or p. 1049, of Oxf. ed. The following character of this man, is given by Strype, from Foxe's MSS. "This Thornden was a man having neither wit, learning, nor honesty. And yet his wit is very ready; for he preacheth as well *extempore* as at a year's warning: so learnedly, that no man can tell what he chiefly intendeth or goeth about to prove: so aptly, that a gross of points is not sufficient to tie his sermon together: not unlike Iodocus a Monk, of whom Erasmus maketh mention in his Colloquies; who, if he were not garnished with those glorious titles, Monk, Doctor, Vice-Dean, and Suffragan, were worthy to walk openly in the streets, with a bell and cock's comb." Strype, Cr. b. iii. c. 1.

It seems very surprising that Cranmer should have been so long and so completely mistaken in this despicable person. It appears, from a letter recently published, that in 1538, the Primate actually recommended him to the patronage of Cromwell, as the fittest person for the office of Prior of Christ Church, Canterbury, of which house he was then a Monk, and afterwards became a Prebendary. See Cranmer's Remains, vol. i. p. 238, 239. Lett. 213.

tent with addressing a private letter to a friend, in contradiction of the reports in question; but he also drew up, with a view to publication, a formal paper, in which he said that, for twenty years, he had been well exercised in bearing evil reports and lies, without being seriously molested; but, that he was not prepared to endure such falsehoods, when they threatened serious injury to God's truth. He therefore signified to the world, that it was not he that set up the Mass at Canterbury; but it was "a false, flattering, lying, and dissembling Monk," who did it without his advice and counsel. To this vindication of himself, he added an intrepid challenge to the adherents of the Romish Church. If the Queen, he said, would but grant him the opportunity, he, together with Peter Martyr, and four or five more, whom he should choose, would undertake not only to defend the Common Prayer, the ministration of the Sacraments, and other rites and ceremonies, but, also, to show, that all the doctrine and religion established by Edward VI., was more pure, and more conformable to God's word, than any that had been known in England for the last ten centuries; and that it was, essentially, the same that had been used in the Church for fifteen hundred years. All this he engaged to prove, on the condition that the matter might be brought to the test of God's word, and that the disputation might be carried on in writing[1].

[1] This Paper may be found in Strype's Cranmer, b. iii. c. 1. Also Cranmer's Remains, vol. iv. p. 1.

Such was the "*Declaration*" of Cranmer, according to the first draft of it: but, before he could revise it,—by some means or other, now not very distinctly known,—it was surreptitiously published[1], and openly read in Cheapside, early in September. Of the copies in circulation, several were brought to the Lords of the Council; and when Cranmer was interrogated whether he was the author of it, he instantly admitted that he was: but he expressed great concern at its premature dispersion; not because he was anxious to disguise his sentiments, but, on the contrary, because it had been his intention to enlarge and correct the document, and then to fix it, with his own hand and seal to it, on the doors of all the Churches in London.

It is by no means improbable, that this "seditious bill," as the Council were pleased to term it, eventually cost the Archbishop his life. It has been thought that when he was summoned before the Council, on the 27th August, and ordered to bring an inventory with him, the intention of the Court was to consign him to privacy and silence, upon a moderate allowance, for the remainder of his days[2]. But when they, subsequently, found him prepared, not only to disavow the Mass, but to publish on every church-door of the Metropolis a sort of Defiance to the whole Romish party, they perceived that it would be madness

[1] It was translated by Val. Pollanus, in 1554, with the following notice,—"Lecta publicè Londini, *in Vico Mercatorum*, ab amico, qui clam autographum surripuerat, 5 Sept. 1553." See Todd's Cranmer, vol. ii. p. 377, note (3).

[2] Strype's Cranm. b. iii. c. 1.

to reckon upon his neutrality, whether his future life were to be private or public. The moment, therefore, was now arrived for laying their hands heavily upon him: and he was accordingly committed to the Tower, (as we have already stated), not merely for his former treason against the Queen, but for his alleged perseverance in exciting tumult and sedition.

That Cranmer was fully prepared for extremities, is quite obvious from the whole of his demeanour, since the establishment of Mary on the throne, and the commencement of severities against the Protestant Ministers and Bishops. From that time he began, in every sense of the expression, to *set his house in order*, and to make himself ready for the worst. One grand object of his anxiety, was the liquidation of all his debts; and when this was once accomplished, so that not a single demand upon him remained unsatisfied, he is said to have exclaimed— "Thank God, I am now my own man; I can now, with God's help, answer all the world, and face all adversities that may be laid upon me." But his fortitude did not show itself merely in this careful discharge of a plain duty. It was soon brought to a much severer test. The prisons at that time began to be crowded with the victims of exasperated Romanism; and numbers among the professors of the Reformation were meditating a retreat into foreign lands, from the perils that were coming, thick and fast, upon their cause. Some, indeed, there seem to have been, whose conscience recoiled, at first, from the thought of flight, as if it were a sign

of cowardice or unfaithfulness. The Archbishop laboured to dissipate these scruples; and for this very purpose addressed a letter to a religious lady of his acquaintance, in which he justified the practice by Scriptural examples; and concluded by exhorting her to withdraw herself, speedily, from the malice of her prosecutors, and God's enemies, to fly into some place where God was most purely served: for this, he said, would be no slandering of the truth, but rather the preservation of herself to God and the truth, and to the society and comfort of Christ's little flock[1]. The advice which the Archbishop had offered to his friends, was now tendered by others to himself: and there can be little doubt that, at any time previous to his committal to the Tower, he might have carried his maxims into practice in his own favour, and placed himself beyond the malice of his adversaries. It is not by any means clear that, *early* in the reign of Mary, and before her government was fully confident of its strength, they would not gladly have escaped the embarrassment of dealing with the case of the Archbishop. To leave him wholly at liberty might be dangerous; to proceed to hateful extremities against him might be more dangerous still. His flight from England would have seasonably cut the knot of their perplexities: but his notions of duty

Cranmer refuses to fly.

[1] Strype's Cranmer, App. No. 72, where the whole letter is printed, addressed "to Mrs. Wilkinson, persuading her to fly." It is also printed in the Letters of the Martyrs, fol. 23, 24. And in Cranmer's Remains, vol. i. p. 363.

would not suffer him to afford them that relief. He had a much more lofty rule of duty for himself, than for others in a humbler rank. He regarded the Primate of England as a standard-bearer, who could not fly with honour, even in the darkest hour of peril: and, conformably to these principles, he was steady at his post, while the followers of the Gospel were rushing in multitudes to the continent, in search of an asylum. When urged to allow himself the benefit of his own principle, he replied that, whatever might be warrantable in others, it would ill become the post he occupied, and the cause he had maintained for so many years, to remove secretly from the realm, as if he were fearful of avouching all that he had endeavoured and achieved for the advancement of true religion [1]. The Council, however, (we have seen) were soon delivered from the difficulty occasioned by the Archbishop's refusal to withdraw: for his demeanour respecting the "Declaration" above adverted to, furnished them with a seasonable, though hollow pretext for committing him to custody, as an incorrigible disturber of the public peace.

The conduct of Cranmer, at this period, was such as would be extolled, in the life of a heathen sage, as an instance of heroic virtue. In a Christian Bishop of the primitive time, it would have been thought an example of constancy, worthy of all honour and

[1] Strype's Cranmer, b. iii. c. 3.—See also Godwyn's Annals. Engl. Trans. p. 165, 166. Ed. 1675.

veneration. The same undaunted spirit continued to support him, in the midst of the dangers which, every moment, were gathering around him. In the month of October the Queen assembled her first Parliament; and among their first labours was an act for confirming the marriage of Henry VIII. with Catharine of Arragon, and thus restoring the legitimacy of the Queen. This was a measure which might be reasonably expected: but, few even among those, to whom the Chancellor was most fully known, could have expected such a consummation of impudence and falsehood, as that which now appeared in the preamble to the statute;—affirming, as it did, that "Thomas Cranmer, late Archbishop, did, most ungodly, and against law, judge the divorce upon his own unadvised understanding of the Scriptures, and upon testimonies of the Universities, and some bare and most untrue conjectures!" Any one, who was ignorant of the previous history, would find it hard to believe, that Gardiner, the present Chancellor of Queen Mary, (from his office, probably the framer of this very act,) had been, of all men living, the most active in fixing upon his mistress the stain of bastardy,—that Gardiner had been working out the pleasure of his master, with all his capacities, long before Cranmer was implicated in the business,—that Gardiner was the man chiefly concerned in bringing Cranmer himself to the notice of Henry, and associating him in the same task. Well may it be affirmed, that the keeper of Queen Mary's conscience

Act for confirming the marriage of Henry VIII. and Catharine.

was a man "past all shame[1]:" for who that was *not* past shame, would endure that a falsehood so contemptible should be put into the mouth of the Legislature; and this, too, for the evident purpose of directing the vengeance of the Roman Catholics against his former colleague in the business of the divorce.

The same parliament which restored the Queen, attainted Cranmer of High Treason.

Cranmer attainted of High Treason.

As a necessary consequence he was divested of the temporalities of the Archbishopric, which were immediately placed under sequestration. He appears to have been severely disquieted by the thought of being branded as a traitor; and he lost no time in addressing to the Queen the petition for pardon, which has been cited above, and which contains the explanation of his conduct in sanctioning the late King's design for changing the succession[2]. He dreaded the ignominy of suffering as a malefactor; but always professed himself ready to meet, with cheerfulness, whatever afflictions he might be called upon to endure in the cause of God[3]. His conviction for treason took place in November; and, at that time, he probably expected that his execution would speedily follow the sentence: for it has been ascertained that, shortly after the attainder, he was publicly led through London, unshaken, and even cheerful, amid the general grief of the spectators, urgently imploring

[1] Burn. vol. ii. An. 1553.

[2] Strype's Cranmer, App. No. 74.

[3] Ibid. b. iii. c. 5.

that there might be no tumults, and declaring that he expected to suffer in the course of eight days[1]. At this period, therefore, it is evident that he entertained no thought whatever of being allowed to expire at the stake, for his faithfulness to his God, instead of perishing on the scaffold, for disloyalty to his Sovereign. It might have been well for his peace had he fallen, as he then expected, by the hand of the executioner: for nothing could well be more deplorable than the whole prospect around him, turn in what direction he might. The chief management of the realm consigned to Gardiner—the faithful Protestants driven into exile, or pining in dungeons—the foreigners, who had been allowed, in the reign of Edward, to form congregations in England, now compelled to remove, and to carry with them the arts and the industry by which they might have enriched the nation—the married Clergy cruelly divorced or deprived—a packed and obsequious Convocation, and a Parliament also at the devotion of the Crown—and what, perhaps, was more bitter than all, the professors of the Gospel beginning to fall away, in the season of persecution, and to defile their conscience by falling down before the consecrated wafer;—these were the visions of sorrow and dismay which now presented themselves to the view of the Archbishop. On every side he beheld the structure, which had cost him so many years of anxiety and

[1] These circumstances are stated by Alasco, in a letter dated Dec. 1553, and cited by Mr. Todd, from Gerdes Miscell. ii. 695. Todd's Cranmer, vol. ii. p. 204, note 2.

toil, crumbling away before his eyes, as if it had been a fabric of clay. But, even in these depths of dejection, he was not left wholly destitute of comfort. When the prisons began to be crowded by the defeat of Wyat's insurrection, three other distinguished martyrs were thrust into the same chamber with him. Their employment in captivity was afterwards described by Latimer to the Commissioners at Oxford; and nothing could better become the situation of men who were lying in peril of their lives for the testimony of the truth: "Mr. Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury," said he, "Mr. Ridley, Bishop of London, that holy man Mr. Bradford, and I, old Hugh Latimer, were imprisoned in the Tower of London for Christ's Gospel-preaching, and because we would not go *a massing*. The same Tower being so full of prisoners, we four were thrust into one chamber, as men not to be accounted of. But God be thanked, to our great joy and comfort, there did we together read over the new Testament, with great deliberation, and painful study: and I assure you, as I will answer before the tribunal of God's majesty, we did find, in the Testament, of God's Body and Blood no other but a spiritual presence, nor that the Mass was any sacrifice for sin. But, in that heavenly book it appeared that the sacrifice, which Christ Jesus our Redeemer did upon the Cross, was perfect, holy, and good,—that God the Heavenly Father requireth none other,—nor *that* ever again to be done[1]."

[1] Strype, Ecc. Mem. iii. 92.

In the course of a few months, these consolatory occupations were broken off. The three Confessors were dragged out of their cell, not indeed to death, but to the intermediate martyrdom of a public disputation. The Convocation had assembled at the same time with the Parliament, at the summons of Boner, who was now restored to the see of London, and exercised the functions of the imprisoned Metropolitan. The composition of this Assembly was so entirely conformable to the views of the Government, that there were not more than six of their number who had the inclination, or the courage, to stand up for the Reformation of King Edward [1]. They proceeded, therefore, with all imaginable alacrity, in the work of demolition. The labours of Cranmer fell rapidly before them. The Liturgy and the Articles were speedily disposed of: and their next care was, to restore the doctrine of the Eucharist to its former honours. A disputation was accordingly held in the Lower House; and, at the especial desire of the Queen, the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was chosen for the subject. A more unexceptionable mode of proceeding could hardly have been adopted, if the contest had been conducted with any semblance of fairness and decorum. But the spirit which presided, may be imagined from the language of Weston, the Prolocutor. "*We have the Word,*" said the Reforming disputants, appealing, as usual, to the Scriptures:—"*But we have the Sword,*" was the reply of

[1] Strype, Cranm. b. iii. c. 6.

the insolent and shameless Moderator. The outcry against the manifest iniquity of these proceedings seems to have awakened the Romanists to some sense of decency: for it was resolved that the controversy should be renewed at Oxford, under the management of a Committee selected from both Universities; and it was further determined that Cranmer, and his two fellow prisoners, who had been excluded from the former conflict, should now be summoned to a share in this[1]. In pursuance of this resolution, they were removed from the Tower to the prison of Bocardo, at Oxford, in the month of March: and in the April following the strife of words was to begin.

1554. Cranmer, Latimer, and Ridley, removed to Oxford.

It would seem as if the dominant party regarded the approaching argument[2] as a crisis of no ordinary importance, if we may judge by the pageantry with which it was ushered in. On Saturday, the 14th of April, the representatives of the Lower House of Convocation, with the Prolocutor Weston at their head, and attended by the Delegates of either University, advanced in procession to St. Mary's, and seated themselves in the choir, in front of the high altar. When their solemn devotions, and the formal preliminaries of their business were dispatched, they sent orders to the Mayor and Bailiffs of Oxford, to bring Dr. Cranmer before them.

Their Disputations at Oxford.

[1] Strype, Cranm. b. iii. c. 10. and App. No. 77, 78.

[2] An ample account of the Oxford Disputations may be seen in the Eccl. Biogr. vol. iii. compiled chiefly from Foxe. Cranmer's share in them may be found in Cranm. Rem. vol. iv. p. 4—78.

The Archbishop soon appeared, guarded by a body of Bill-men. He stood with his staff in his hand, with a grave and reverential aspect; and in that posture he remained, having declined a seat, which they had the courtesy to offer him. The Prolocutor opened the proceedings with an harangue, in which he observed how commendable a thing was unity in the Church of Christ: and then, turning to the Archbishop, lamented that he, who once had been a Catholic man, should have made an unseemly breach in the unity of the Church, not merely by setting forth erroneous doctrine, but by teaching a new faith every year. It was, however, her Majesty's earnest desire that he should, if possible, be recovered from his schismatical separation; and she had, accordingly, been pleased to charge them with the office of reclaiming him. He then produced the three Articles, which had been agreed upon as the main points for discussion; the first of which affirmed, the corporeal presence in the Sacrament of the Altar; the second, declared the Transubstantiation of the consecrated Elements; the third maintained the life-giving and propitiatory virtue of the Mass. The Archbishop, being desired to pronounce his opinion on these propositions, replied that nothing could exceed his value for unity, as the preserver of all human commonwealths; the advantages of which he illustrated by various instances from ancient story: and he added, that he would most cordially embrace it,—provided always that it were a unity *in Christ*, and conformable to the word of God. He then deliberately read the

Articles over, three or four times; and being asked whether he would subscribe them, he said that, as they were there worded, they were all false, and at variance with Scripture: and that, consequently, he must decline all *unity*, of which these propositions were the basis. He offered, nevertheless, that he would prepare his answer in writing by the next day, if he might be allowed a copy of the Articles. The Prolocutor assented; but told him that his answer must be in readiness that very night, and that he would be called upon to maintain the points of his dissent, by scholastic argument in Latin, in the Public Schools. He was then consigned again to the custody of the Mayor, and conducted back to his confinement at Bocardo[1], which was no better than a filthy prison, for the reception of ordinary criminals. His demeanour on this day was, throughout, so distinguished by venerable gravity, and modest self-possession, that several of the Academics, who disapproved his opinions, were moved by it even to tears.

The next day, Sunday the 15th of April, a grand and solemn banquet was held by the Commissioners at Magdalen College, after the sermon at St. Mary's, which was delivered by Harpsfield, Chaplain to the Bishop of London. In the course of the evening the written answer of Cranmer was sent in to the Prolocutor, who was entertained at Lincoln College. In

[1] "Bocardo is a stinking filthy prison for drunkards, and harlots, and the vilest sort of people." Ridley to Bradford; Letters of the Martyrs, 59,—Coverdale's *note*.

this paper[1] he professed that he could acknowledge no such thing as a natural body of Christ, which should be merely spiritual,—the object of intellect and not of sense,—and not distinguishable into parts or members. He contended, with the ancient Doctors, that the bread and wine were called the body and blood of Christ, by a mode of speech that was purely figurative; and that the guests at the Holy Table of Christ are there reminded that his Crucifixion supplies a nutriment as needful for our souls, as material sustenance is needful for our bodies. He, lastly, maintained that the oblation of Christ upon the Cross was of supreme and final efficacy; and that to seek for any other sacrifice for sin, would be to make the great propitiation of none effect.

On Monday, the 16th of April, at about 8 o'clock, the Commissioners proceeded, with the usual pomp and formality, to the Divinity Schools; and Cranmer was brought forward to undergo the *baiting* of a public dispute. He was immediately conducted to the respondent's desk, and near him were seated the Mayor and Aldermen of Oxford. The business was opened by the Prolocutor in a speech, which commenced with the following sentence. "Brethren, we are this day met together, to confound that detestable heresy of the verity of Christ's body in the Sacrament." This exordium was so ludicrously equivocal, that it was received with an universal burst of laughter. As soon as the indecorous merriment had

[1] Coll. ii. Rec. 82.

subsided, the Prolocutor continued his harangue—the main object of which was to show, that to oppose the doctrine of Transubstantiation, was neither more nor less than to deny the power and truth of God. Upon this the Archbishop remarked, that they were met for the discussion of certain *controverted* matters, which, yet, they were told, it was unlawful and even impious to dispute: and " if this be so"—he added —" surely mine answer is expected in vain." The contest respecting the *indisputable* points, nevertheless commenced. " Your opinion, Reverend Master Doctor," said Chedsey [1], who was to begin the debate, " is different from the Scripture, therefore you are deceived." To this specimen of logical audacity, Cranmer replied, of course, by denying the former proposition. The opponent then contended, that the word " body" was to be taken in its literal acceptation; and that it had always been so taken by the Church. Cranmer, on the contrary, insisted that the language was wholly metaphorical, and that the Church had so understood it from the beginning; and this proposition he offered to maintain by arguments which he had prepared in writing, and which he now desired might be read aloud. The request was, apparently, acceded to by Dr. Weston; but, notwithstanding this, the paper was never read. It would be impossible to detail the remainder of the controversy, without filling a great portion of our volume.

[1] This disputation with Chedsey is printed in Cranmer's Remains, vol. iv. p. 4—66.

The whole was, in truth, a scene of wearisome and most disorderly wrangling. It lasted from eight in the morning till nearly two in the afternoon. The argument was carried on sometimes in English, and sometimes in Latin. The Prelate was compelled to stand alone against a multitude of antagonists. He was perpetually assailed with unmannerly interruption. The Prolocutor disgraced himself by heaping epithets of disparagement upon the Archbishop; and his offensive vehemence was a signal for turbulence and clamour to the miscellaneous auditory: so that the schools resounded, at intervals, with hissing, and hooting, and peals of laughter, and other symptoms of vulgarity and rudeness: and the assembly was at length dismissed by the exemplary Moderator, with an invitation to the crowd to express their sense of triumph, by shouts of "*Vicit veritas.*"

Such were the courtesies which dignified an important and solemn theological argument, in the sixteenth century, and in the most renowned university of Europe! The process by which the late Primate of England was to be stamped as a heretic, was such as, at the present day, would almost disgrace the hustings, at a period of the most tumultuous political excitement. The uproar which, on this occasion, was suffered to dishonour an assembly of scholars and divines, and to heap oppression and insult on the first Ecclesiastic in the realm, may partly be ascribed to the semi-barbarous condition of society: and it might perhaps be too much to affirm, that nothing of a similar description had ever occurred, when Roman

Catholics, instead of Protestants, had been placed on their defence [1]. But it may, I presume, be very confidently asserted, that never before were the decencies of public discussion so infamously violated, as on this trial of Cranmer and his two associates. The very persons themselves who had been guilty of these outrages on equity and common humanity, appear to have been stricken with a sense of shame: for on Thursday, the 19th April, Cranmer was produced in the Schools once more, in the character of an oppo-

[1] Any one who wishes to see the *gravamina* of the Roman Catholics, relative to the manner in which the public discussions between them and their adversaries were conducted, may find them in the Jesuit Persons's "Review of ten Disputations in the time of Edward VI. and Queen Mary." His first instance is somewhat unfortunate; for he confesses that Peter Martyr was almost hissed out of the Schools by the Scholars and the hearers. With regard to the third of these debates, he complains (on the authority of Archdeacon Langdale, who was present), that it was conducted with great inequality—that the Protestants were unfairly assisted by the Moderator, Ridley,—and that the Catholics were interrupted and borne down by taunts and menaces. The fourth disputation the Jesuit calls a ridiculous colloquy, and likens it to the barking of little beagles! In the seventh disputation (the first in Queen Mary's time), Philpot is said to have been very disorderly, and to have talked bravely of his readiness to be burned: a readiness which, "*in his mad mood*," —as the Jesuit describes it,—he, afterwards, gloriously manifested. In adverting to the three last,—in which Cranmer, Ridley, and Latimer were baited, he, very coolly, says, that "if Foxe say truly, the manner of arguing was not so orderly and School-like as it might have been." Review, &c. &c. p. 41. 75. Ed. 1604. The copy consulted by me is in the Library of Trinity College, Cambridge. G. 7. 32.

nent to Harpsfield, who was then to perform his exercises for the degree of Doctor of Divinity [1]. The contest on this day, seems to have been carried on with a much more creditable show of order and propriety. The first part of the dispute, related merely to the authority of the Church, as a guide to the safe interpretation of Scripture; but the parties soon found themselves again on the old debateable ground of the corporal presence: and then there followed a long course of bickering, after the scholastic manner, in which the most awful topics were bandied to and fro, in language which, (to say nothing of its monstrous absurdity), has, to our ears, a sound of gross irreverence, if not of positive impiety. It was debated—for instance—whether the body of our blessed Saviour was present in the Sacrament in such a manner, that he could be *eaten*,—whether he was there *substantially*, or, only *as touching his substance*, but *not after the manner of his substance*,—whether his body could have *quantity* in heaven, while it was present, *without quantity*, on earth,—whether *quantity* could be predicated of it at all, or whether it were not rather *quantitative*, or existing, not actually *in quantity*, but *after the manner of quantity*—whether Christ were swallowed, in the Sacrament, by wicked men,—and, if so, how long he remained in the eater! At the present day, it must appear beyond measure astonishing, that grave and learned men could endure to desecrate the

[1] An account of this Disputation is printed in Cranmer's Remains, vol. iv. p. 67—76.

most solemn mysteries of our faith with all this worthless metaphysical jargon. It must be remembered, however, that Cranmer in resorting to it, acted purely on the defensive: for though he was, on this occasion, personally the opponent, his cause was, throughout, the object of aggression; and it was absolutely essential to the honour of that cause, that he should show himself a complete master of the weapons with which the warfare against it was usually carried on. His consummate accomplishment in the scholastic learning, enabled him to acquit himself with a steadiness and serenity, which extorted praise even from Weston himself, who, before, had appeared well nigh destitute of all aptitude for the common civilities of creditable society. "Your wonderful gentle behaviour, good Master Doctor Cranmer," said the Prolocutor, "is worthy of much commendation; and, that I may not deprive you of your right and just deserving, I give you most hearty thanks, both in my own name, and in the name of all my brethren." And thereupon all the Doctors present, courteously put off their caps: and, with this outward show of respect, the Archbishop was dismissed back to his prison [1].

In order to secure the narrative from interruption, I have hitherto purposely abstained from all mention of the share which was borne by Ridley and Latimer in this famous disputation: and, even now, our notice of it must, unavoidably, be brief. The day appointed

[1] Strype's Cranmer.

for Ridley, was Tuesday the 17th of April; for Latimer, Wednesday the 18th. The insults they experienced were precisely similar to those which had been heaped upon the Archbishop. The treatment of Latimer was, indeed, if possible still more disgracefully brutal. The venerable and simple-hearted man stood before the Commissioners, completely broken down with age and infirmity—professing himself at all times but slenderly qualified for the conflicts and stratagems of theological debate—pleading that his memory was then well nigh gone, so that he was no longer master of the moderate resources which he once possessed—and declaring that, even if he were armed at all points, his bodily decay would utterly disable him from the fatigues of such a contest[1]. The hearts must have been strangely seared, which could resist an appeal like this, from the lips of a feeble old man, bending under the weight of fourscore years! And yet it *was* resisted. He, who had worn a mitre, and had preached in the presence of Kings, was now borne down and brow-beaten, and assailed with taunts, and revilings, and merciless derision. Whatever may be the merits or demerits of the Roman Catholic creed, there was enough in this odious scene to cover with ignominy the individual Roman Catholics who happened to preside at it; and to make both Papists and Protestants blush at the thought, that the persons who thus degraded themselves were

[1] He said he was as fit to dispute, as to be made Captain of Calais!

men of England! One quality, however, there was, in the venerable prisoner, which neither the weakness of age, nor the cowardly malice of his auditory, could suppress, even for an instant—and that was, his unconquerable strength of purpose. The Prolocutor reproached him with his stubbornness. "It cometh," said he, "merely of vain glory, and will do you no good when a faggot is in your beard: and we all see, by your own confession, how little cause you have to be stubborn; for your learning is in *feoffor's hold*[1]. The Queen's Grace is merciful, if ye will but turn." "You shall have no hope of me to turn," was the reply of Latimer; "I pray for the Queen daily, that *she* may *turn* from this religion." And so, he was sent back to his dungeon, for an obstinate and incorrigible misbeliever.

The might and accomplishment of Ridley gave much more serious trouble to his Inquisitors. The Martyr was in the full vigour of his faculties; and never were his powers and attainments exhibited to more triumphant advantage. He, as well as Latimer, had more of constitutional firmness than the Archbishop: and this invaluable property, combined with the activity of his faculties, enabled him to produce his store of things, both new and old, with a readiness and self-possession, which perpetually confounded his opponents, and forced from one of them the bitter exclamation, that, even if he were to main-

[1] A legal expression, signifying, I suppose, that it was conveyed away from the owner, and lost to him.

tain the heresy of Arius, the subtlety of his wit would enable him to shake off the authority of the Fathers, and even of the very Scriptures themselves. All, however, was to no purpose. When the three days' controversy was over, the Papists cried out *victoria*, and told the combatants, to their faces, that they were fairly vanquished. The Protestant professors, on the contrary, were unspeakably elated with the issue of the conflict: and their sense of the faithfulness and courage of their three champions was expressed to them, in a letter of congratulation from Rowland Taylor, (himself in bonds for the faith), which breathes in every word of it, the gallant and even joyous spirit of that stout-hearted Christian. It would be a grievous wrong to the memory of Cranmer and his colleagues, to omit one syllable of it.

Letter of Rowland Taylor to Cranmer, &c.

"Right Reverend Father in the Lord,—I wish you to enjoy, continually, God's grace and peace through Jesus Christ. And God be praised, again, for this your most excellent *promotion*, which ye are called unto, at this present,—that is, that ye are counted worthy to be allowed among the number of Christ's records and witnesses. England hath had but few learned Bishops that would stick to Christ *ad ignem inclusivè*. Once again, I thank God, heartily, for your most happy onset,—most valiant proceeding,—most constant suffering of all such infamies, hissings, clappings, taunts, open rebukes, loss of living and liberty,—for the defence of God's cause, truth, and glory. I cannot utter with pen how I rejoice in my heart for you

three, such captains in the foreward, under Christ's Cross, banner, or standard, in such a cause and skirmish: when not only two of our Redeemer's strong holds are besieged, but all his chief castles, ordained for our safeguard, are traitorously impugned. This your enterprize, in the sight of all that be in heaven, and of all God's people in earth, is most pleasant to behold. This is another manner of nobility, than to be in the forefront of worldly warfares. For God's sake, pray for us; for we fail not daily to pray for you. We are stronger and stronger in the Lord, His name be praised: and we doubt not that ye be so, in Christ's own sweet school. Heaven is, all and wholly, of our side. Therefore, *gaudete in Domino semper, et iterum gaudete et exultate.* Rejoice always in the Lord, and, again, rejoice and be glad.—Your assured in Christ, Rowland Taylor [1]."

Cranmer, Latimer, and Ridley condemned.

On the 20th of April, the three Prelates were again brought to St. Mary's,—again they were peremptorily asked, whether or not they would subscribe the Articles,—and again, they were told that they had been defeated in fair open disputation. Cranmer instantly repelled the assertion, and protested that, so far as he was concerned, the whole proceeding had been most iniquitously conducted; that he had been exposed throughout to clamorous interruption; and that it would have been impossible for him either to oppose, or answer, as he was prepared to do, without conde-

[1] Strype, Cranm. b. iii. c. 10.

scending to an unseemly brawl, with four or five antagonists at once. The other two declared that they would stand to every word that they had uttered: upon which the three were placed together, and the reading of their sentence commenced, by which they were pronounced to be no longer members of the Church. In the midst of his task the reader was interrupted, and the prisoners were asked—once more and finally—whether they would turn or no? "Read on, in the name of God,"—was their unanimous reply,—"for we are not minded to turn;" and the officer then completed the promulgation of their doom. The moment he had finished, the Archbishop exclaimed,—"From this your judgment and sentence, I appeal to the just judgment of the Almighty; trusting to be present with him in heaven, for whose presence in the altar I am thus condemned."—"I trust," said Ridley, "that although I be not of your communion, my name is written in another place, whither your voices will soon despatch us." And, "I thank God most heartily," added Latimer, "that he hath preserved me to glorify him by this kind of death." The three were then sent back to the prison, as condemned and excommunicated heretics.

The Prelates, notwithstanding their patient bearing in the contest, were honestly indignant at the manner in which it had been conducted: and they did not fail to endeavour that the world should be in full possession of their grievances. That no unfair or imperfect statements should get possession of the public ear, Ridley drew up a careful account of his

own part in the controversy, to which he annexed a preface, complaining of its vexatious disorder, compared with which the clamours of the Sorbonne were patterns of modesty [1]. The Archbishop, in like manner, was impatient to lay before the Government a representation of these unrighteous dealings: and accordingly drew up a letter to be laid before the Lords of the Council, in which he began by soliciting their intercession with the Queen for pardon of his treason, and briefly appealing (as he had done before, in his petition to Mary herself) to their own knowledge of the manner in which he had been entangled in the project for her exclusion. His main object, however, was to denounce the partiality and confusion of the proceedings at Oxford. How the other two disputants were *ordered*, he professes himself ignorant, as the three were separated from each other. As concerning himself, the following is his own account:—“ Doctor Chedsey was appointed to dispute against me; but the disputation was so confused, that I never knew the like; every man bringing forth what him liked, without order. And such haste was made, that no answer could be suffered to be taken fully to my argument, before another brought a new argument. And in such weighty matters, the disputation must needs be ended in *one day*, which can scarcely be ended in three months! And when we had answered them, they would not appoint us one day to bring forth our proofs, that they might answer

[1] Strype, Cranm. b. iii. c. 10.

us, being by me required thereunto: whereas, I have more to say than can be well discussed, as I suppose, in twenty days. The means to resolve the truth, had been, to have suffered us to answer fully to all that they could say; and then, they again to answer as fully to all that we can say. But why they would not answer us, what other cause can there be, but that either they feared their matter, or, that they were unable to answer us? Or else, for some consideration, they made such haste, not to seek the truth, but to condemn us,—that it must be done, in post haste, before the matters could be thoroughly heard. For, in all haste, we were all three condemned of heresy. Thus much I thought good to signify to your Lordships, that you may know the indifferent handling of matters, leaving the judgment thereof unto your wisdom.—And I beseech your Lordships to remember me, a poor prisoner, unto the Queen's Majesty: and I shall pray, as I do daily, for the long preservation of your good Lordships, in all godliness and felicity [1]."

It appears from this letter, that the Government still hesitated to do that for which Cranmer was so impatient,—namely, to wipe off from his name the stain of traitor, and to leave him to his fate as a condemned heretic. It is not positively certain, that this despatch ever reached its destination, to expedite his suit. It is dated the 23d of April, and was ready

[1] This letter is dated April 23, 1554. It is printed in Cranmer's Remains, vol. i. p. 365. Lett. 297.

previously to the departure of Weston from Oxford. In an unlucky moment, the Archbishop bethought him of entrusting this missive to the care of the Prolocutor, who charged himself with its safe delivery. The writer had speedy cause to repent this ill-placed confidence. The unmannerly churl had the baseness to open the letter on his journey; and finding the contents so little to his own credit, as President at the recent debate, he immediately sent it back to the Archbishop. Whether any other means were taken to forward it to the Council, is now unknown. It is, however, probable enough that it may have reached their Lordships, by some messenger, more trusty than the Reverend Prolocutor of the Convocation[1]!

It happened, fortunately, that the office of recording the particulars of this disputation was committed to two faithful friends of the Archbishop, who acted as notaries on the occasion. One was Gilbert Mounson, the other no less a personage than Jewel, the celebrated Apologist of the Church of England. An account of the whole, under the seal of the University, and the subscription of these trusty officials, was exhibited by Weston to the Convocation; and from this, compared with the narratives drawn up by Cranmer and Ridley themselves of all they could remember, the history transmitted to us, has, probably, been compiled[2]. The Papists were so much elated with the victory which they claimed, that they

[1] Strype's Cranmer, b. iii. c. 2. [2] Ibid. c. 10.

were extremely anxious for a repetition of its glories at the other University. It was their intention that Hoper, Bradford, and others, who were then in custody, should be conveyed to Cambridge to make sport for their oppressors, as Cranmer and his two colleagues had done at Oxford. But these men had, happily, learned wisdom from the fate of their brethren. Anxious as they were to suffer all extremities for the good cause, they saw no necessity for giving their adversaries another opportunity of gracing their iniquitous dealing with the name of *victory*. It was accordingly recommended by Hoper that, if they consented to dispute at all, and should find themselves assailed in the course of the debate with scoffs, and yells, or any similar interruptions and insults, they should, instantly, refuse to carry on the disputation for one moment longer, and demand that the discussion should, thenceforward, be held before the Queen and Council, or else in the presence of the whole Parliament[1]. The effect of this wise counsel was seen in a declaration put forth by the principal Protestant Confessors, then imprisoned in London, in which they positively refused all disputation, to be held before a tribunal of Commissioners: but expressing their entire readiness to maintain their opinions, in the way of public argument, in the presence of her Majesty and her Council, or before either house, or both houses of the Legislature. The

The other Protestants decline disputation, but offer to answer before the Council or Parliament.

[1] Strype's Cranmer, b. iii. c. 11.

same memorable document contains an intrepid and articulate statement of their reasons for this determination—a statement, which is equally remarkable for its tone of respectful deference for established authority, and for its intrepid exposition of their reasons for declining a jurisdiction which had been so shamefully abused. And by this protest they manfully vindicated their own integrity, and their unabated confidence in the cause to which they had devoted themselves; while, at the same time, they most effectually defeated the malice and obliquity of their persecutors.

It might reasonably have been expected that the instant execution of Cranmer and his two friends, would be the consequence of their unflinching assertion of their principles. But this was not so; for eighteen months elapsed from the period of the Oxford disputation, before Ridley and Latimer were dragged to the stake; and there was an interval of some five months more between their martyrdom and that of Cranmer. The cause of this delay may be easily explained. The wishes of the dominant party had been *swift to shed blood;* so *swift*, that Gardiner was never backward to grant commissions for the trial and condemnation of heretics; so *swift*, that the egregious Prolocutor, when doubts were started as to the strict legality of these proceedings, scrupled not to exclaim—"It forceth not for a law; we have a commission to proceed with them; *when they be dispatched, let their friends sue the law*[1]."

[1] Strype's Cranmer, b. iii. c. 13.

The Queen's Council, however, were hardly prepared to keep pace with this precipitation. The Papal authority, and, with it, the whole body of the Canon Law, had been abolished in England. The Queen, on the other hand, was withheld, by her own principles, from the exercise of her powers as Head of the Church. The consequence was, a complete vacancy in the supreme Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction. By the common law, indeed, a heretic might be punished with death: but the secular arm, by which death was to be inflicted, was utterly powerless, unless the heretic had been convicted before a competent tribunal; and, for the reasons above stated, no such tribunal could now be said to exist in the kingdom. Besides, in the cases of the three Prelates, there was this additional difficulty,—that the Commissioners who had pronounced their condemnation, were only Priests; whereas it was the ancient and uniform practice of the Church, that Bishops should be tried by judges of their own order[1]. It does not, indeed, appear, that Cranmer and his fellow-sufferers, had raised this objection to the legality of their sentence: but the maxim, on which that objection might be founded, though not insisted on by the prisoners themselves, was hardly to be disregarded by those who, still, in their hearts, adhered to the Papal system. These considerations were of sufficient weight to give pause to the Council of the Queen; and to produce a resolution, that the

Cranmer, &c. reserved for another trial, when the Pope's authority should be restored.

[1] Coll. vol. ii. p. 369.

Judges, and legal advisers of the crown, should be consulted, respecting the disposal of the offenders, convicted, as they had been, of obstinate heresy, by the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge. The life of the Archbishop, it is true, was already under forfeit to the law; for he was attainted of treason, and was still unpardoned: so that he might, at any moment, have been sacrificed, had such been the pleasure of the government. But then, to single him out for execution, would be a most invidious proceeding, when others, much more guilty, and, among them, Roman Catholics, had been spared; and, further, to bring him to the scaffold as a political offender, would have been to defraud the spirit of intolerance of its highest and chiefest victim. The result of their deliberations was, that, before the fires of persecution could be kindled, it would be *necessary* to restore the authority of the Pope, and *advisable* to revive the sanguinary statutes, which had been repealed in the reign of the Reforming King. It was, moreover, felt that nothing would appear more detestably iniquitous, than to execute, by virtue of those revived enactments, offenders who had been tried and condemned previously to such revival; and that it would consequently be expedient to treat the proceedings at Oxford as a nullity, and to await the issue of a fresh trial, before a legally constituted Court.

Cranmer, &c. still detained in prison.

But if the want of a competent authority rendered the sentence against the prisoners questionable, it must, in precisely the same

degree, have affected the legality of their imprisonment for heresy. In spite of this obvious consideration, however, the scruples of the Court produced no interruption, or even mitigation, of their captivity. They were still dealt with as convicted criminals. Cranmer was detained in custody at Bocardo: while Ridley and Latimer were consigned to the care of individual inhabitants of Oxford. Their treatment appears to have been marked both by severity and caprice. Ridley complained that, after their condemnation, "it changed, like sour ale in summer." They were deprived of the services of their own people, and placed under the guardianship of churlish and watchful keepers. They were not always allowed the comfort of implements for writing. All free communication between them was well nigh prohibited. They were occasionally harassed by ridiculous charges of attempting to escape from their confinement. And what, perhaps, was more afflicting than all, they were avoided by the members of the University like men infected with pestilence. It was remarked by Ridley as a "wonderful thing" that their solitude was not cheered by a single office of kindness from any one of their brethren in scholarship[1]. The sympathies of humble and unlettered men were much more lively than those of the learned orders. The townsmen of Oxford, and many at a distance, to whom the prisoners were known only by their virtues and their

[1] Strype's Cranmer, b. iii. c. 11.

sufferings, were generous in supplying their necessities. Provisions and clothing were despatched to them from London, with a liberality which drew forth expressions of the most cordial thankfulness from Ridley. It further appears that they were assisted with money ; but this relief was partially intercepted by occasional embezzlement. At length, indeed, directions were given by the government for their support: though, to the egregious dishonour of the Court, the persons who furnished it, were never able to recover more than a very small portion of the amount expended by them in obedience to the order [1].

These multiplied vexations, however, were insufficient to depress the fortitude of the martyrs. The prison-house was, with them, a scene of holy meditation, or useful labour. Poor old Latimer, indeed, was able to do little more than repeatedly peruse the New Testament; and this he did till his soul was filled with the spirit of the volume, and endowed with such *might in the inward man*, that the infirmities of the flesh were forgotten and set at nought. The labours of Ridley were such as might have reflected glory on a period of the most entire comfort and leisure [2]; although he was sometimes compelled to write with strips of lead, cut from the windows of his dwelling; and, for want of paper, to commit his thoughts to the margin of his printed

[1] Strype's Cranmer, c. 21.

[2] A list of these may be found in Strype's Cranmer, b. iii. c. 11.

books[1]. The time of the Archbishop was occupied, partly in discussions with learned men of the opposite persuasion; but, chiefly, in the vindication of his work on the Sacrament, in answer to Bishop Gardiner's book, entitled Marcus Constantius; three parts of which were actually completed by him during the period of his confinement[2]. Many of the other imprisoned Gospellers employed their solitary hours in exertions equally beneficial to their cause; and the pastoral letters of consolation and instruction, addressed by them to their brethren in affliction, are said to have been signally instrumental in furthering the Reformation.

Within three months from the time of their condemnation, the Queen was united to Philip of Spain: and, in the course of the summer, Pole came to England, with legatine authority, to reconcile the kingdom to the Church, and to absolve the Parliament and Convocation from the guilt of heresy and schism; an indulgence which was accordingly administered with great solemnity before the termination of the year. No exertions had been spared to collect a House of Commons "of the wise, grave, and *Catholic* sort;" and the means resorted to, for the accomplishment of this purpose, were such as openly outraged all freedom of election[3]. The temper of the Con-

[1] Strype's Cranmer, b. iii. c. 18.

[2] "Two of these were lost in Oxford, and one came into the hands of John Foxe; but even that part is gone, with his fellows, for aught that I can find among Foxe's papers."—Ib. c. 18.

[3] Ib. c. 12.

vocation was in equal harmony with the wishes of the Court. Soon after their assembling, an address was presented by the Lower House to the Upper, the petition of which consisted of twenty-eight Articles; one of which was for the destruction of heretical writings, and, among them, of Cranmer's Book on the Sacrament; of the Protestant Communion office; and all "*suspect*" translations of the Bible. Another of these Articles recommended the revival of the Statutes enacted against the Lollards, and false preachers, in the reigns of Richard II., Henry IV., and Henry V.; and the restoration of the Bishops, and other Ecclesiastical Ordinaries, to their ancient jurisdiction over heretics, schismatics, and their abettors[1]: a suggestion which was faithfully carried into effect in the following December.

Revival of the persecuting Statutes.

In the midst of these impending terrors, the imprisoned Reformers maintained a demeanour suitable to the grandeur of the cause for which they were called to suffer. It was in the May preceding that they had declined the proposed disputation at Cambridge: and in their declaration to that effect, they complained, loudly and boldly, that they were detained in durance, not as rebels and traitors, but only for their faithfulness to the word and truth of God. After the union of Mary with Philip of Spain, another address was pre-

Courage of the Reformers.

[1] Burnet, vol. ii. An. 1534. Strype's Cranmer, b. iii. c. 13.

sented by these "prisoners for the gospel, to the King and Queen, and their most honourable High Court of Parliament;" in which they express their alarm for the miseries threatened by the recent "horrible *deformation* of the Church of England, and the danger occasioned by it to the salvation of those, who had brought the kingdom back from light to darkness." They conclude their paper with a repetition of their challenge, to maintain before the Parliament, either in writing or by oral discussion, all the measures of King Edward's Reformation; and this, too, "on pain of being immediately burned" if they should be vanquished in the contest, or of "suffering whatsoever other shameful and painful death it should please the King and Queen's Majesty to appoint[1]." In these proceedings, they nobly followed the example of the Archbishop, who (as we have stated above) was preparing, soon after the accession of Mary, to fix a similar challenge, in his own name, to the gates of every Church in London; and who, afterwards, entreated the Queen's permis-

[1] Their Address may be read in Strype's Cranmer, b. iii. c. 14. Append. No. 74. And yet it has been asserted by a Papal writer, that "*in order to ward off impending danger,* they composed and forwarded *petitions,* including a confession of their faith, both to the King and Queen, and to both Houses of Parliament!" (Ling. vol. vii. p. 261.) If they forwarded a single line which indicates their shrinking from danger, *let it be produced.* Most certainly there is not a syllable in the document above alluded to, but what breathes a spirit of undaunted readiness for the most cruel extremities.

sion to exhibit to her Majesty his views respecting the religious prospects of the country. The letter, which has been quoted above, and which he had addressed to Mary, soliciting pardon for his defection, concluded with an expression of his earnest wish that he might have licence to "write his mind to her touching the state of religion in the realm of England." In strict conformity with the principles he had uniformly maintained, he there acknowledges that "the Reformation of things that be amiss," pertains entirely to the office of the Sovereign; and that "to private subjects it appertaineth quietly to suffer what they cannot amend. Yet, nevertheless," he adds, "to show your Majesty my mind, in things pertaining unto God, methink it my duty, knowing what I do, and considering the place which, in time past, I have occupied [1]." It must have required no ordinary constancy and fortitude, for Cranmer to intimate to a Princess so incurably bigotted as Mary, his readiness to vindicate the proceedings which she so notoriously and heartily detested; more especially in the very hour of his peril and disgrace, when a regard for his own safety might, naturally enough, have prompted him to abstain from any topic which might exasperate her displeasure against him. It is almost needless to add, that his application, if it ever

Cranmer's request to "utter his mind" to the Queen respecting Religion.

[1] Strype's Cranmer, b. iii. c. 5. Append. No. 74.—Letters of the Martyrs, fol. 1—3. Cranmer's Remains, vol. i. p. 362, 363. This letter is without a date. But it must have been written in 1553.

reached the Queen, was wholly disregarded. A Princess, who is known to have steadily refused even to look into an heretical volume, was not very likely to encourage, or even to endure, the reasonings of the great heresiarch of her kingdom. It will be seen that he did, afterwards, "write his mind" very fully and distinctly, to her Majesty. But at the time in question, he was compelled to content himself with uttering his thoughts as he best might, before the Commissioners at Oxford; and this, upon a very small portion of the subjects, which he was anxious to discuss in all their comprehension. The manner in which the exercise of this privilege was accorded to him, and the signal ability and learning with which he sustained the onset of his adversaries, have already been related in the present chapter.

CHAPTER XVI.

1555—1556.

Persecution of the Reformers—Fresh Commission for the trial of Latimer and Ridley—Authority obtained from Rome for the trial of Cranmer—His examination before Brokes—The process closed on the 13th Sept. 1555—Cranmer cited to appear at Rome in 80 days—His two Letters to the Queen—Pole's Answer—Cranmer sentenced to excommunication, at Rome—The Pope's Letter for execution of the sentence—Degradation of Cranmer—He appeals to a General Council—His appeal disregarded—His Recantations—Order for his Execution—Is visited in prison by Cole and Garcina—Is taken to St. Mary's, previously to his death—Proceedings there—Cranmer's demeanour—He retracts his Recantation—Is hurried to execution—His behaviour at the stake—Reflections on his fate.

THE year 1555 was a time of horror in England; for Popery regained complete possession of the land. But its dominion was exercised in a manner precisely adapted to secure its eventual and final expulsion. It would be needless, and almost puerile, to give utterance to the feelings of indignation and abhorrence, which the recollection of that sanguinary period is sure to awaken in every English heart. The scenes which speedily followed the union of Mary with her Spanish husband, are more or less familiar to nearly every child in the

1555.

kingdom. With regard, therefore, to the general history of those atrocities, and the almost incredible manner in which the victims were supported under them, it may be sufficient to observe, that nothing can well be more hopeless than the attempt which has been, occasionally, made to destroy the credit of the celebrated narrative, in which they are principally related[1]. It is impossible to question the sub-

[1] The work of Foxe was compiled, with unwearied industry, from documents and materials of unquestionable authority; and it was subjected by him to scrupulous revisal, during the remainder of his life; which was protracted for many years beyond the period of its first appearance. The truth of it is amply attested, in solemn and impassioned language, by Bishop Jewell. In his answer to the Apology, (c. iv. div. 5.) Harding had called Foxe's Acts and Monuments, "the dunghill of your stinking Martyrs." The following is Jewell's reply to this coarse and brutal language—"It pleaseth you, for lack of other evasion, to call the story of the Martyrs a dunghill of lies. But these lies shall remain on record for ever, to testify and to condemn your bloody doings. Ye have imprisoned your brethren; ye have stripped them naked; ye have scourged them with rods; ye have burned their hands and arms with flaming torches; ye have famished them; ye have drowned them; ye have summoned them, being dead, to appear before you out of their graves; ye have ripped up their buried carcases; ye have burned them; ye have thrown them into the dunghill; ye took a poor babe, and, in most cruel and barbarous manner, ye threw him into the fire. *All these things, Mr. Harding, are true. They are no lies.* The eyes and consciences of many thousands can witness your doings. The blood of the righteous Abel crieth unto God out of the earth; and, undoubtedly, he will require it at your hands."—Works of Bishop Jewell, p. 27, 28. Ed. 1609. See also pt. iii. c. 1. div. 3, p. 315. And again, pt. iii. c. 2,

stantial truth of that recital, without supposing it to be such a prodigy of fiction, as never before was

div. 1.—"Our wantons and flesh worms, for so it liketh you to call them, have been contented to forsake fathers, mothers, wives, children, goods and livings, and meekly to submit themselves to all the terror of your cruelties, and to yield their bodies unto the death; to be starved with hunger, to be burned with fire, only for the name of the Gospel of Jesus Christ. So delicate flesh-worms and such wantons are they. Ye will say, that they died stubbornly, in wilful error. Yet, I reckon not ye will say, they died in great pleasance, or carnal liberty. It is a strange kind of fleshly wantonness, for a man to take up his cross and follow Christ. And yet this is the substance of our Gospel."—Ibid. p. 316.

With regard to the fidelity of Foxe, in the use of documents and records, we have the following testimony of Mr. Todd, himself an investigator whose accuracy is far above suspicion:—"In the numerous researches, which it has often been my duty to make among ancient registers, and other records, the accuracy of Foxe, in such as he has applied to his purpose, *is indisputable*."—Hist. and Crit. Introd. to Cranmer's "Defence, &c. &c." p. iv. note (f.) 1825.—This is an additional confirmation of what had before been asserted by Dr. Wordsworth,—"All the researches and discoveries of later times, in regard to historical documents, have only contributed to place the general fidelity and truth of Foxe's melancholy narrative, on a rock which cannot be shaken."—Pref. to Eccl. Biogr.

To the above testimonies may be added that of Miles Coverdale, in his Preface to the Letters of the Martyrs, London, 1564. If any one can believe, that a Protestant writer would dare to put forth the statements there made—(statements which abundantly confirm those of Foxe, though no reference is made to him)—and, further, that the same writer could do this within seven or eight years after the occurrence of the alleged enormities, and with an appeal to living witnesses, being conscious all the while that the account was groundless, or grossly exagger-

attempted by the most unscrupulous master of forgery. And even if certain odious details should be brushed away from its solid mass of facts; enough would still be left to make us at once proud and ashamed of our nature: ashamed of it, for its dreadful capacities of evil,—proud of it, for its almost superhuman powers of endurance.

With *whom* the persecution originated, is sometimes spoken of as a matter of uncertainty: and, in truth, the question is of very trifling importance. It originated, doubtless, in the same dreadful spirit, which, in former times, had erected the Inquisition, and had desolated the plains of Languedoc, and the valleys of Piemont. By whose mouth the proposition was first uttered, it might be very difficult to pronounce. When Gardiner was charged by the Marian protomartyr Rogers, as the prime mover of these cruelties, he is said to have affirmed that the Queen went before him, and that the motion was her own. That she, on her part, would be prepared to listen to the suggestions of her inhuman lord, cannot reasonably be doubted: and it can scarcely be questioned that the Legate, Cardinal Pole, was more inclined to measures of extreme severity than has sometimes been imagined. The orders issued by him in the preceding year, for the *reconciliation* of the laity, were well adapted for the purpose of marking out victims

ated,—if any one can believe this, all that can be said is, that it shows the wonderful power of party spirit in sharpening the historical digestion!—See the Appendix to this work, No. 3.

for destruction; for he directed that a book should be kept, for registering the names of all those, who should return to the Church in every parish throughout England, in order that it might be known who was reconciled and who was not; and that proceedings might be taken against those who obstinately persisted in their alienation[1]. The truth probably is, that the whole Papal party rushed forward into persecution by an almost simultanecus impulse. They only awaited the signal; and by whom that signal was actually given, is a matter of very little moment. With regard to the Queen herself, it might scarcely be just to load her with the undivided guilt of these bloody dealings. It may be sufficient to state, that if she was not the sole prompter of the persecution, she, at least, conformed, with great alacrity, to the spirit of the time. In so doing, it may be true that she inflicted nothing, but what she herself would have been ready to endure, in testimony of her own faith. She seems to have inherited from her mother an invincible firmness of purpose, together with the temperament of an austere and fanatical devotee. Of her entire sincerity not a doubt can justly be entertained. It will be recollected, that no remonstrances could shake her resolution to restore the Abbey lands which had been attached to the Crown; and, with them, the first-fruits and tenths, a branch of the Papal revenue which had been seized into the hands of her

[1] Strype. Cranm. b. iii. c. 12. and Append. No. 81. Wilk. Conc. vol. iv. p. 138, 139.

father. This restitution she regarded as an act both of justice and of piety: and when it was represented to her, that her liberality would seriously impair the dignity of her Crown, she replied that she valued her salvation more than ten kingdoms. It is further known, that she was extremely anxious to wrest their unhallowed plunder from the hands of the laity: and though she was utterly baffled in this attempt, it still may be justly affirmed that her reign arrested, for a time, the progress of spoliation; which, if her brother had lived many years longer, would, probably, have stripped the Church of all its temporal possessions, or, at all events, have left it in a state of the most ruinous indigence. Neither is there any cause for believing that benevolence was wholly a stranger to her nature; for she was conspicuously attentive to the wants of the poor; and is said to have often ministered to their necessities, with a patience and kindness which would have done honour to a *Sister of Charity*. Nevertheless, there was, assuredly, a hardness of character about her, which is always intolerably repulsive in a female: and she was, also, unhappily possessed by a principle, which excluded a certain class of her subjects from the pale of her sympathies. In her judgment, a heretic had forfeited all claim to compassion. He was a being hateful to God and man: and, to consign him to torture, was to render an acceptable service to Heaven [1].

[1] This principle is very openly and honestly avowed by Sanders, who speaking of the execution of Cranmer, says, that the ancient laws for the punishment of heretics were renewed, with a

In the month of June, 1555, it was generally believed that the Queen was likely to present her subjects with an heir to the throne. From this calamity, however, a gracious Providence delivered us. And, here, it is with reluctance that I advert to a story which has been transmitted to us upon the authority of a letter of Peter Martyr;—namely, that when the Queen was persuaded that she was likely to become a mother, she protested that she could not dare to hope for a prosperous delivery, unless all the heretics then in prison were burned to a man [1]. For the

zeal most worthy of a Christian Princess; whereby, not only the heretical Archbishop, but also, *some hundreds* of false prophets, were taken off. De Schism. Anglic. lib. ii. p. 231. ed. 1628.

A modern Romanist, (Dr. Lingard), has treated the matter differently. He describes the "long and cruel persecution of the Reformers," not as an honour to this "Christian Princess," but as "the foulest blot upon her character" But then he suggests, that "it is but fair to recollect, that the extirpation of erroneous doctrine was inculcated, as a duty, by every religious party:" and, he adds—"Mary only practised what they (the Reformers) taught:"—as if the Queen stood principally indebted to the Reformers, for her knowledge of the best means of repressing the Reformation! If, however, the Reformers taught this lesson, of whom did they originally learn it? The historian knows well, that his own Church was the great and original teacher of the lesson: and that by her consistent example it was, that zeal and fierce intolerance had been so long, and so closely, yoked together, that even the spirit of the Reformation was, at first, scarcely venturous enough to put them asunder.

[1] Strype's Cranmer, b. iii. c. 17. Burnet's account is, that a letter was written from London *to* Peter Martyr, retailing this horrible anecdote. Burnet, vol. iii. An. 1555.

credit of human nature—for the honour of womanhood—one would gladly refuse all credit to an imputation so detestable. It must, however, be confessed that the work of death could not well have gone forward more impetuously, even had it received its impulse from a vow so dreadful. Rogers, Hoper, and Rowland Taylor had been brought to the stake early in the present year. The destruction of Cranmer, Ridley, and Latimer, was delayed, as we have seen, in consequence of the illegality of the sentence pronounced by the Commissioners at Oxford. In the interval, the lay-proprietors of the Abbey-lands were secured, by Act of Parliament, in the possession of their plunder; and, in return for his acquiescence in this pacific measure, the Pope was reinstated in the plenitude of his jurisdiction. The Cardinal-Legate was thus placed in a condition to exercise his powers consistently with the law. He had, with great pomp, reconciled the nation to the Pope, by a formal absolution, towards the end of 1554; but it was not till Sept. 1555, that a fresh Commission was issued by him for the trial of Ridley and Latimer. The Metropolitan dignity of Cranmer demanded a process of greater solemnity: for, according to the usage of the Romish Church, it was requisite that the authority for proceedings against him should issue directly from the Pontiff himself.

Fresh Commission for the Trial of Latimer and Ridley; and authority obtained from Rome for that of Cranmer.

It was on the 12th of September, 1555, that the Primate was summoned into the presence of his

judges [1]. The chief of the inquisitors was Dr. Brokes, Bishop of Gloucester, who sat as representative of the Cardinal *de Puteo*, the chief Commissioner appointed by the Pope. With Brokes were associated the civilians Martin and Story, who appeared as Proctors for the King and Queen, and who, on the behalf of their Majesties were to demand the examination of the Archbishop. The commission was held in St. Mary's Church, at Oxford. The High Commissioner was seated on a scaffold erected close by the High Altar. Beneath him were the two civilians, one on either side; and,

Cranmer's examination before Brokes.

[1] I have thought it needless to refer to my authorities for every minute particular of these well-known proceedings, and of those which followed. Those proceedings are very amply detailed in Foxe (Eccl. Biogr. vol. iii. p. 516. 609.), and in Burnet, An. 1555; and, more concisely, in Strype's Cranm. b. iii. c. 19, 20, 21. See also vol. iv. of Cranmer's Remains, p. 79. 117. There are two accounts of this examination given by Foxe. But it so happens, that there is some reason for doubting the accuracy and faithfulness of the longer one. See Cranmer's Remains, vol. iv. p. 87, 88. 99. 110. There is also a third, contained in the Official Latin Report, first supplied by Mr. Todd in the Addenda to the Oxford edition to Strype's Cranmer, 1812. But even upon this document no implicit reliance is to be placed: for Cranmer had requested that he might have an opportunity to correct the Notary's minutes of his answers, before they became part of a judicial record; which was promised him accordingly. But the promise never was fulfilled: and this unrighteous dealing was one of the complaints in his subsequent appeal to the next General Council. See his letter to Martin and Story, in Sept. 1555. Remains, vol. i. p. 367. letter 298; and his letter to a Lawyer, in Nov. 1555. Ibid. p. 384. letter 301.

lower still, was an assemblage of Doctors. The Church, of course, was crowded with an anxious auditory; and after the members of the Court had taken their places, the voice of the proper officer was heard to pronounce the following summons,—"Thomas, Archbishop of Canterbury, appear here and make answer to that which shall be laid to thy charge, for blasphemy, incontinence, and heresy; and make answer to the Bishop of Gloucester, representing the person of the Pope." The Archbishop, who was already in the Church, was then brought forward, in front of the Assembly, habited in a black gown, with his Doctor's hood upon his shoulders. His head had hitherto been covered; but when he approached the platform, on which the Papal Commissioner was seated, he turned to the Royal Proctors, and took off his cap successively to each of them, and bowed on one knee to them, as the officers of his Sovereign. He then fixed his regards on the Papal President, but neither "vailed his bonnet," nor did him any other reverence. The representative of Christ's Vicar upon earth, rebuked him for this want of courtesy, and said, that it might well beseem him to acknowledge, with the customary marks of respect, the supreme authority with which the Commissioner was invested. The Archbishop immediately replied, that he was prompted to forbear all outward token of submission, not by want of personal respect toward the Bishop of Gloucester, but solely by regard for the oath by which he had bound himself never to recognize the Papal authority in this realm—an oath which he

was resolved to keep inviolate; but that, if the powers of the President had been derived from the Crown of England, instead of the See of Rome, he would instantly have acknowledged them, with all customary signs of deference. The Sub-Delegate then addressed the prisoner in a speech[1] of merciless prolixity; in the course of which he reminded the *Apostate* of the tender mercies of the Queen, who had hitherto consented to spare him, *in hope of his amendment;* and began the perfidious work of seduction by suggesting, that if he would but repent, it was ten to one that it might still be as well with him,—yea, rather better,—than when he was Archbishop of Canterbury, and Metropolitan of England[2]. The High Commissioner was followed by Martin, the Royal Proctor, who delivered an oration,—more reasonable for its brevity, if for nothing else, than that which had preceded,—in which he accused the Archbishop as the patron of discord, adultery, and all mischief. He then produced the instruments which conferred their authority on himself and his colleague, Dr. Story, together with the articles of accusation against the Archbishop. On this, Cranmer having obtained permission to enter on his defence, immediately repeated the Lord's Prayer, upon his knees. He then rose upon his feet, and recited the Articles of the Creed: and on the conclusion of it proceeded to his vindication[3]. He began by declaring that he protested against the juris-

[1] Eccl. Biogr. vol. iii. pp. 519—530. [2] Ib. p. 526.
[3] Ib. p. 532, &c.

diction of the Bishop of Rome, and required that his protestation should be recorded. When this was done, Martin reminded him, that in abjuring the power of the Pope, he refused the very authority to which he was indebted for the continuance of his life; for that, by the law of the land, he was already but a dead man, having been attainted as a traitor to the Queen. In reply to this, Cranmer protested, before God, that he was no traitor; and this, in spite of the confessions made by him, at his arraignment: in which confession, he said, he had admitted more than was true. Being ordered by Martin to proceed at once to the matter of his defence, he addressed the Court at considerable length. He said, that if he were a transgressor, the laws of his country were sufficient for his punishment; and that he was deeply afflicted to think that, on the very day when her Majesty took a solemn oath to observe those laws, she had, likewise, taken another oath, which tended to their subversion. Submission to the Pope, he affirmed, was wholly inconsistent with allegiance to the Crown; since it involves the treasonable principle that Emperors and Kings hold their regalities of a foreign Bishop, who claims the power of deposing them at his pleasure, and who takes upon himself to exalt the spiritual authority above the laws and customs of the realm. As for the charges of heresy and schism, he protested that if *he* had taught heretical doctrine, then not only the primitive Fathers, but the Apostles, and even Christ himself, were teachers of heresy; that all the Scriptural marks of

Antichrist, were collected in the Papal power; and that, with regard to the Eucharist, he would be content to abandon all opposition to the Romish doctrine, if the corporeal presence could be proved out of any one doctor within more than a thousand years from our Saviour's appearance on earth. Upon this there ensued some altercation between the accused and the President. Cranmer did not hesitate to aver that Brokes had been guilty of perjury, in sitting as Judge for the Pope, after having received his Bishopric from the King: and when the Bishop replied, that it was Cranmer himself who induced him to acknowledge the Royal supremacy, he was reminded that this recognition was made by him, under his own hand, in the time of Archbishop Warham, three quarters of a year before the advancement of Cranmer to the Primacy! To this very incommodious fact the Bishop had no other answer ready, but that sort of reply with which authority is sometimes apt to overbear truth and reason,—"We come to examine you; and you, methink, examine us."

The business was next taken in hand by the other Proctor, Story, who laboured to vindicate the competency of the present tribunal; and charged the Archbishop with stubborn contempt against their Majesties[1]. The examination was then resumed by Dr. Martin. He asked the Archbishop whether immoral or irreligious oaths were binding on the con-

[1] Ecc. Biogr. vol. iii. p. 540, &c.

science,—such, for instance, as an oath to live in dissolute intercourse with a strumpet,—an oath to abstain from all acts of charity,—an oath like that of Herod, or of Jephthah;—and he affirmed that an oath to renounce the authority of the Pope was precisely on a footing with any of those above enumerated: which Cranmer, of course, denied. The Proctor then assailed him with indignant comments upon his attempt to nullify, by a clandestine protest, the oath he had taken to the Pope, on his promotion to the Archbishopric; which Cranmer repelled by declaring, that he had done nothing, on that occasion, but what had been sanctioned by the most learned Civilians that could be found[1]. And, again, when Cranmer solemnly affirmed that he came most reluctantly to that promotion, the examiner had the effrontery to affirm, that the King sent for him from Germany, purely because no other man could be found within his realm, "to set forth his strange attempts;" and that it might be fairly conjectured that there was a compact between King Henry and himself, to this effect,—"Give me the Archbishopric of Canterbury, and I will give you licence to live in adultery." To this flagitious calumny Cranmer is represented to have given a direct contradiction, in four short words,—"You say not true." But it is scarcely credible that he should have satisfied himself with this bare form of denial, when so much more

[1] As this subject has already been fully considered, Ante. vol. i. c. 3, it is needless to advert further to it here.

might have been said to heap confusion on his adversary: and here, therefore, as well as in other places, we have a strong confirmation of what is intimated by Foxe, that the Romish Reporter has given but a very partial and imperfect account of this part of the proceeding [1]. Martin then went on to charge the Archbishop with measures and principles that might well become the Devil himself,—and this, very much in the spirit, and almost in the exact language, which had once been used in the pulpit by Bishop Gardiner [2]. He concluded by asserting that Cranmer had taught three distinct Sacramental Doctrines: to which the Primate answered, that he never had taught but two *contrary* doctrines; namely, the Papist's doctrine, which he held when Lambert was burned as a Sacramentary; and the opinion of the Sacramentaries, which he embraced after conference with Ridley, and an accurate examination of authorities [3]. His accuser, lastly, pressed him with the absurd consequences of holding that a temporal Prince can be supreme head of the Church of Christ; alleging that, if this were so, the Emperor Nero, one of the bloodiest persecutors of the Church, must nevertheless have been its head. In answer to this, Cranmer affirmed that Nero *was* head of the Church, consi-

[1] Eccl. Biog. vol. iii. pp. 543, 544.

[2] See Ante, vol. i. c. 8. pp. 202, 203.

[3] It has already been remarked, that there is some difficulty in reconciling the declarations here *ascribed* to the Archbishop with certain other particulars, which seem to indicate that he once held the Sacramental doctrine of Luther.

dered as a temporal society of men; and that, in the same sense, the Turk was head of the Christian Church in Turkey [1].

When all this skirmishing was over, the grand assault commenced by the production of sixteen articles of accusation, to which he was required to give his answers, *seriatim* [2]. The first of these charged him with having married one Joan, surnamed Black, or Brown, *before he was in holy orders*. To which he replied, that he certainly married one Joan, whether Black or Brown he knew not: and he might, surely, have well expressed his astonishment at finding this fact placed at the head of the charges against him [3]. It was, next, alleged that after the death of Joan, he entered into holy orders, and was made Archbishop *by the Pope*. His answer was, that he did indeed receive certain Bulls from the Pope, for his investment with the Archbishopric, but that he delivered these Bulls to the King, from whom alone he received that promotion. He further allowed that he married a second time, after he was in orders,—that he retained his wife privately, so long as the statutes of the realm permitted,—that he had several children by her,—and that he afterwards, in the time of King Edward, lived with her openly,—and that he made this confession

[1] This is actually the case at the present day.

[2] Eccl. Biogr. p. 553, &c.

[3] It should be remarked that this charge, though found in Foxe, does not appear in the Latin official report to Rome. See Strype, Cranm. App. Addenda, No. 2. Oxf. Ed. p. 1077.

without the slightest remorse or shame. With regard to the books, which he was accused of publishing, he admitted himself the author of the "Defence of the true Catholic Faith," and of the "Answer to the Bishop of Winchester;" and that he was concerned in editing the Catechism and Articles; but denied that he had any share in the treatise on the Sacrament by Peter Martyr, though he believed the book to be *good and Catholic.* He also denied that he ever compelled subscription to the Articles, but admits that he received subscriptions voluntarily made. In reply to the remaining charges, he denied that he had been guilty of heretical doctrine, or schismatical practice,—asserted that, in renouncing the authority of the Pope, he was sanctioned by the Acts of the English Parliament,—allowed that, since the passing of those laws, he had consecrated Bishops, and done other things, which formerly were done by the Pope, —insisted that, previously to the late restoration of the Papal authority, the kingdom was in a good state, and heartily wished that it had so continued; and, lastly, professed that he had no intention to resume obedience to the Pope, or in any manner whatever to admit his jurisdiction.

When these items of accusation were disposed of, the Archbishop was harassed by a renewal of verbal questioning[1], which drew from him a repetition of his former assertion, that he accepted the Primacy with unfeigned reluctance; that when he was overborne

[1] Ecc. Biog. vol. iii. p. 557, &c.

by the impatience of the King, he still resolved never to receive that honour from the Bishop of Rome; that his protestation to that effect was made by the advice of Civilians, who were consulted by his Majesty's order, and was duly enrolled, as a solemn and public act.

The next subject of the Proctor's rhetoric, was the marriage of the Archbishop; and here, with almost incredible absurdity, he declared that the children of the Primate were no better than bondmen to the See of Canterbury; a sarcasm which Cranmer easily disposed of, by asking him, what must then be the condition of the bastards of a Priest who kept a concubine, and whether they were to be reckoned as bondmen to the Benefice? After this, in reply to further questions relative to the Supremacy, he affirmed that Christ was the only Head of the Church, and of the faith and religion of the same: but that the King is head and governor of his people, which are the visible Church. "What?" said Martin, "you never durst tell the King so."—"Yes, that I durst," replied Cranmer, "and *did*: and in the publication of his style, wherein he was named supreme Head of the Church, there was never other thing meant."

At length, after a variety of vexatious interrogation, another wearisome harangue from the High Commissioner, and a short, but egregiously insolent address from Story, the proceedings of this day were closed, by producing eight witnesses, and swearing them to give testimony relative to the matters in

The process against Cranmer closed Sept. 13, 1555.

question. The Archbishop was then apprized that he was at liberty to offer exceptions against any of these witnesses: upon which he instantly declared, that he challenged them, one and all, as men who had been guilty of perjury; since they had once taken an oath against the Pope, and now appeared in court to maintain and defend his power. This challenge, however, was utterly disregarded, and the Archbishop was remanded to his prison. On his departure, as on his entrance, he refused to honour Brokes with any mark of obeisance. The next day, Sept. 13, the depositions of the witnesses were taken [1], and the process brought to a close; and an official report of the whole was speedily transmitted to Rome.

[1] The names of the witnesses were as follows, in the order of their depositions:—

1. Richard Croke, D.D.
2. Robert Warde, A.M., Public Prelector in Philosophy.
3. Robert Serles, B.D.
4. William Tresham, D.D., Canon of Christ Church.
5. James Curtopp, A.M., Dean of Peterborough.
6. George London, B.D.
7. Richard Smythe, D.D., Prebendary of Christ Church, Public Prelector in Divinity.
8. Richard Marshall, D.D., Dean of Christ Church, and Commissary of the University.

The depositions of these men may be seen at full length in the Latin Report of the Process. Strype, Cranm. Append. Addenda No. 2. These depositions were unknown to Foxe and Strype; but they form part of the Process lately printed in the Oxford Edition of Strype, and furnished by Mr. Todd, from the Lambeth MSS. No. 1136. They occupy nearly thirteen close octavo pages.

It must here be remarked that, previously to these proceedings, Cranmer had received a citation, dated Sept. 7 [1], commanding him to appear at Rome in the course of eighty days, there to answer for himself, in person, before the Pontiff: and yet, during that time, he was kept in custody, and disabled from stirring beyond the precincts of Bocardo. This citation, it seems, was issued in conformity with the provisions of the Canon Law, which required that an Archbishop, charged with heresy, should be complimented with a summons into the presence of the Pope. The whole, however, was nothing more than empty fiction [2]. Obedience to the order was absolutely impossible ; and it operated purely as a respite of execution for the period prescribed. The subsequent history of Cranmer justifies a suspicion, that this adherence to the letter of the Canons was dictated by other motives than a scrupulous regard for ancient usage. Eighty more days of suspense and solitary confinement, it might be hoped, would gradually undermine the integrity and firmness of the Archbishop, and prepare him for an attempt to preserve his life by a submissive revocation of his errors. At all events, the experiment was well worth trying, even though it should proclaim to the world the shameless inconsistency of the Papal practices.

Sept. 7, 1555. Cranmer cited to appear at Rome in eighty days.

[1] Eccl. Biog. vol. iii. p. 507, note 5.

[2] Dr. Lingard states, that it was a mere matter of *form*. Hist. Eng. vol. vii. p. 272.

Cranmer's Letters to the Queen.

It was not long after Cranmer was sent back to prison, to await the final sentence from Rome, that Ridley and Latimer were brought to the stake. It does not come within our design to describe the immolation of these two Christian worthies. The story of their martyrdom has been often told, and must always be interesting, even in the thousandth repetition. Although they were brought to trial subsequently to Cranmer, their sentence and execution long preceded his: and every one who has ever looked into the memorials of those dreadful times, must recollect the triumph, which their death exhibited, of the spiritual energies over the infirmities of flesh and blood. Whether this melancholy spectacle was seen by Cranmer, has not been very distinctly ascertained. According to the statement of Foxe, at the moment when the fatal procession passed his prison, he was engaged in disputation with Friar de Soto, who attended him in prison for the purpose of reclaiming him from his errors. By others it is related, that he afterwards surveyed the execution from the top of the north gate, and there put up a prayer to Almighty God that they might be graciously supported under their mortal agonies. A few weeks subsequently to the martyrdom of his friends, he received a long letter from Cardinal Pole, written at the Queen's desire, in answer to two letters which had been addressed by Cranmer to the Queen herself, shortly after the *last* proceedings at Oxford, but *previously* to the sacrifice of Latimer and Ridley. Of these, the former is* of con-

siderable length. It contains, first, a cogent summary of the grounds upon which he had laboured to abolish the jurisdiction and supremacy of the Bishop of Rome, in explanation of his refusal to acknowledge Brokes for his Judge. And, secondly, it vindicates, with uncompromising boldness, the Sacramental doctrine which had been received by the Protestant Church of England. Of the other letter, a fragment only is remaining: but this fragment is of singular importance to the fame of Cranmer: for it, intrepidly, requests of her Majesty to ponder well the terms of her oath to the Pope, and to consider whether they could be reconciled with the language of her oath to the kingdom, taken on the day of her coronation. It therefore repeats, as it were to her Majesty's face, what he had publicly intimated in his examination before Brokes; namely, that she must needs be forsworn either to the Bishop of Rome, or to the State of England. It concludes by protesting, that, if her Majesty would permit him, he would appear at Rome in person, conformably to the *canonical* citation, trusting that God would enable him to defend the truth there, as honestly as he had defended it in his own country [1].

These two papers, be it always kept in mind, were addressed by Cranmer, when he was under sentence

[1] These two Letters are printed in the Letters of the Martyrs, fol. 3—16, and in Cranmer's Remains, vol. i. 369—383. They will also be found in the Appendix to this Volume, No. 4. The former of them contains the most authentic statement of Cranmer's views respecting the question of the supremacy.

of death, to one who had notoriously closed the gates of mercy against him. He must have known that he was regarded by the Queen, as the instrument of her sainted mother's degradation, as a conspirator against her own title to the Crown of England, as an apostate from the doctrine of the *Catholic* Church, and as a traitor to the Apostolic authority of its Head. He must, in short, have been conscious that he was in the very jaws of destruction. And yet, in this fatal extremity, he suffers not one syllable of deprecation to escape him. Unwilling as he had been to die under the imputation of treason, he was well content to suffer for the truth of God; and, accordingly, presents to his exasperated and implacable Sovereign, a firm but respectful vindication of the principles which she abhorred. And this, too, he did, at a time when the fires of persecution were blazing throughout the land, and when his two most honoured associates were in readiness to be offered up. These letters, therefore, are invaluable, as monuments of his hitherto immoveable fidelity to the cause of the Reformation.

Pole's answer to Cranmer.

The office of answering these addresses was consigned by her Majesty to Cardinal Pole. His performance, in obedience to the mandate, is dated *November the sixth :* and, on one account, it is quite as interesting as the letters to which it replies; for it proves, beyond all possibility of contradiction, that, up to that period likewise, the fortitude of Cranmer remained wholly unshaken. It speaks of him throughout, as an incurably blind

and pertinacious heretic; charges him with covetousness and ambition, with deliberate malice, abject ignorance, and gross perjury; and declares, that if he is not plucked out of the lion's mouth, he must inevitably be undone, both in body and in soul[1]. Language like this could only be addressed to one whose courage had, to that hour, withstood every assault[2]. It would, therefore, be most injurious to

[1] It is curious enough, that Pole allows the Protestant doctrine of the Sacrament to be the *more probable*. But then he contends that this very *probability* is, itself, an indication of its falsehood; the father of lies being always ready to deceive us by an appeal to sense and reason.

The whole of the Cardinal's Letter (with the exception of certain parts, which appear to have been obliterated in Foxe's MS.) is printed in Strype's Cranmer, Append. No 89. It is very prolix and tedious, extending to seventeen closely printed octavo pages; and exhibits but a poor specimen of the scholar-like elegance which has often been ascribed to Pole by his admirers.

[2] It must be carefully observed, that the burning of Latimer and Ridley took place *early in October*; whereas the letter of Pole is dated *Nov. 6th*, 1555; thus demolishing, at a single blow, the statement of Dr. Lingard, that the sight of their execution was too much for Cranmer's fortitude; that from that moment he began to waver; and that he, thenceforth, seemed ready to listen to the solicitations of the Cardinal for his conversion.

The fragments of evidence by which the Historian endeavours to support this extraordinary assertion, are so miserably poor, that they are hardly worth the trouble of dissection. In the first place, he produces the following sentence from Pole's correspondence:—"Is non ita pertinacem se ostendit, aitque se cupere mecum loqui" (Pole to Philip ii. v. 47): from which nothing is to be collected but what was, already, quite notorious; namely, that Cranmer was at all times, and under all circumstances, not

doubt that, if Cranmer had been called to suffer at the same time with Latimer and Ridley, and before his powers of resistance had been undermined by temptation and artifice,—he would then, like them, have

only willing, but anxious, to enter into fair discussion of the principles of his faith. He was ready to confer, and actually did confer, with Friar de Soto. He urgently solicited permission to defend his doctrines to the Queen herself. Of course, then he would be equally prepared for a conference with the highest Ecclesiastic in the realm.

In the next place we have the following passage from one of Pole's biographers:—"Magnam spem initio dederat; eique veniam Polus ab ipsa Reginâ impetraverat." This extract may be found in Dudith, pp. 71, 72. Ed. 1690. We shall be better able to see what it is worth, by producing the context: "Non minorem anteà quoque curam et studium Polus adhibuerat, ut saluti Thomæ Cranmeri, (qui ante se Archiepiscopus Cantuarensis fuerat, quique tum Oxonii in custodiâ servabatur), consuleret; ad eumque bis scripserat, *si posset*—(pravis ejus opinionibus, contra Sacramentum altaris, et Primatum Pontificis Romani confutatis)—ad sanitatem illum perducere. *Cujus rei magnam spem initio ille dederat; eique veniam Polus ab ipsâ Reginâ Polus impetraverat:* quanquam ea, non publico solum, sed etiam privato nomine, illi meritissimo jure erat infensa." All of which amounts to nothing more than this,—that Pole attempted to bring Cranmer to *soundness* of opinion, and that his efforts were abortive, although at first he entertained great hopes of success; hopes into which he might easily enough be betrayed, by Cranmer's candid readiness to confer and to debate. Besides, there is not a syllable in either of these passages, which connects the alleged disposition of Cranmer to *relent*, with the spectacle of Latimer's and Ridley's execution. Of the pardon (or whatever is meant by *venia),* here affirmed to have been obtained for Cranmer by the Cardinal, no mention, so far as I am informed, is to be found in any other writer. The Queen was, all along, bent upon his destruction.

poured out his soul unto death, with the heroism of a Christian Martyr.

A report of the last proceedings against the Archbishop, had been despatched to Rome immediately on their termination. On the 29th of November, the eighty days, appointed for his appearance, had elapsed. On the 4th of December, at the instance of Cardinal de Puteo, he was sentenced to excommunication, and deprived of the Archbishopric: and, on the 11th of the same month, the administration of the See of Canterbury was conferred on Cardinal Pole[1]. The final executory letter of the Pope, was dated on the 14th of December. In faithful conformity with the *Canonical* fiction, adverted to

1555. 4th December.

Cranmer sentenced to excommunication, at Rome.

The Pope's Letter for executing the Sentence. Dec. 14th.

[1] Eccles. Biog. vol. iii. p. 570.—"It were long to shew, in particular," (says Bishop Jewell,) "what laws Mr. Harding's friends used, when they sat upon the Bench...... Their holy one of Rome burned the most Reverend Father, Doctor Cranmer, at Rome, in a mummery, before he saw him, or heard him speak; and yet, notwithstanding, they arraigned him at Oxford, and judged him afterwards to be burned. They first took and imprisoned the innocent, that had broken no law; and, afterwards, devised a law to condemn him...... First, they scattered and forced their Masses through the realm, against the law; afterwards, they established the same by a law; last of all, the next year they summoned and had a solemn disputation in Oxford, to try whether their own law were good or no. In order of nature, the disputation should have been first, and then the law; and, last of all, the execution of the same among the people."—Reply to Harding, p. 358. Ed. 1609; cited in Eccl. Biog. vol. iii. p. 571, note 6.

above, this document affirms that, having been cited to Rome, "*he took no care to appear*[1];" and, by this neglect, had incurred the guilt of *contumacy*. It then proceeded to declare, (much in the same spirit of fiction) that "he, Pope Paul IVth, *sitting in the throne of justice, and having before his eyes God alone, who is the righteous Lord, and judgeth the world in righteousness*, did make his definitive sentence, decreeing the said Thomas Cranmer guilty of the crimes of heresy, and of other enormities, and unmindful of his soul's health, and of the doctrines of the Fathers, and traditions, and usages of the Church, more especially in the matter of the Sacrament of our Lord's Body and Blood; respecting which, he had introduced the perversions of those Arch-heretics, Berengarius, Wiclif, and Luther. For these causes, he, the Pope, declared him excommunicated, and commanded the Bishops of London and Ely, (Boner and Thirlby,) first to degrade him from his Archbishopric, and then to deliver him to the secular arm[2]."

[1] "*Comparere non curaret.*"

[2] Wilk. Conc. iv. 132—136; where, also, may be found a complete form for the degradation of an Archbishop; which concludes with a "*Canonical fiction*" still more disgusting than the preceding. When the delinquent is delivered over to the secular arm, it is with the following recommendation to the secular judge: "We beseech you, with all the affection possible,—by the love of God, by your regard for piety and mercy, and by the intervention of our prayers—that you will not bring upon this most wretched man, any peril of dismemberment or death." Ib. p. 136. It is quite astonishing that the world should, for ages together, have endured such mockery as this.

It was not till the 14th of February that this Pontifical mandate was carried into execution. On that day the Archbishop was summoned to appear before the two Papal Delegates in St. Mary's Church. When he was brought into their presence, their Commission was recited to him; in which it was specified, that "all things had been indifferently examined on both parts, and *Counsel* heard, as well on the behalf of their Majesties, who were the accusers, as also on the behalf of the accused: so that he wanted nothing which was needful to his defence." Here was another *fictitious* statement, of such enormous impudence, that it extorted an indignant exclamation from Cranmer; who (although he was a most accomplished Canonist,) appears to have been quite unable to comprehend the *Canonical* scruples, which dictated these insulting and mendacious formalities. It was notorious, he said, that he had been so closely imprisoned, that it would have been utterly impossible for him to employ an Advocate, even if his cause had been finally adjudged in his own country. How then was he to produce witnesses, or appoint Counsel, to represent him at Rome? "God," he added, "must needs punish this open and shameless lying."

1556. 14th February.

Degradation of Cranmer.

The process of degradation, nevertheless, commenced. A complete suit of Episcopal habiliments was produced; but, by way of mockery and derision, the whole was made either of canvass, or of some other material equally worthless; and something,

which represented a Crosier, was placed in his hand. The spirit of the Archbishop was not, one jot, depressed by this scornful treatment. On the contrary, with light-hearted pleasantry, he exclaimed, "What!—I verily believe I shall say Mass."—"Yea, my Lord," (said Cosins, one of Boner's Chaplains,) "I trust to see you say Mass yet, for all this."—"Do you so?" replied Cranmer—"nay, that shall you never see; for never will I do it." When Boner beheld his victim before him, in this insulting Pontifical masquerade, he was unable to suppress his exultation; and, with his usual vulgar brutality, he cried out—"This is the man that despised the Pope's Holiness, and is now here to be judged by the Pope. This is the man who hath pulled down so many Churches, and is now come to be judged in a Church. This is the man that contemned the blessed Sacrament of the Altar, and now is come to be condemned before that blessed Sacrament hanging over the Altar. This is the man that, like Lucifer, sat in the place of Christ, upon an Altar, to judge another, and now is come before an Altar to be judged himself." The torrent of invective was, here, interrupted by Cranmer, who exclaimed—"In this you do belie me, as in many other things. You speak of the time when I sat in commission in Paul's Church; where was a scaffold erected *by you and by your officers:* but, that there was an Altar under it, I neither knew nor suspected." Boner, however, was not easily to be diverted from the pleasure of reviling. He continued to indulge himself in it, till the audience were filled with weariness and disgust; and

the form of degradation accordingly proceeded. In the first place, the Crosier, the ensign of the Pastoral office, was to be taken from his hand: but this the Archbishop intrepidly resisted. He refused to part with it, till he had drawn from his sleeve a written paper, which he handed up to Thirlby, desiring the by-standers to witness, that he thereby solemnly appealed against these proceedings, to the next General Council. The reasons for this step, as specified in the document in question, were, in substance, as follows[1]:—1. That in cases of life and death, a man should be allowed to plead in his own person, and not by a Proctor; whereas, he was hindered by his strict imprisonment from appearing at Rome: and, further, that, even if he would have sent his Proctor, the sequestration of his property disabled him from engaging one.—2. That when he was cited to appear before the Pope's Sub-delegate, Bishop Brokes, he was denied the assistance of Counsel for his defence.—3. That, in violation of their own express promise, the Royal Proctors had omitted to furnish him with copies of his answers to the charges preferred against him, and had thus denied him an opportunity of correcting them.—4. and 5. That he renounced altogether the Papal jurisdiction, as utterly at variance with the constitution of his country; and, also, because it had been found most ruinously to drain away the resources of the realm.—6. That the authority of the Pope is subver-

Cranmer appeals to a General Council.

[1] Eccl. Biog. vol. iii. p. 575—583.

sive both of the Holy Scriptures, and of the decrees of General Councils. He concluded by averring that "in all his doctrine and preaching, both on the Sacrament, and every other point, he meant and judged those things, as the Catholic Church, and the most holy fathers of old, with one accord, had meant and judged them." He, further, "desired, the first, the second, and the third time, instantly, more instantly, and most instantly, that he might have letters of protection and defence, with choice and liberty to correct and interpret his sayings; and, if this were granted, he promised to prosecute his appellation, with the view of disannulling abuse, iniquity, and unrighteousness."

When this paper was handed up to Thirlby, he replied that their commission was to proceed against him, "*all appeal being taken away* [1]"—(in other words, that the Pope had strictly prohibited all question of his own authority)—but added, that "he would, nevertheless, take care that the appeal should be received if possible."—The next step in the process of degradation was to strip off what was the semblance of the Episcopal pall; and here the Archbishop once more protested against the irregularity of the proceeding. "Who is there among you," he said, "that hath a Pall, that he should take away my Pall [2]?"—implying that a Metropolitan

[1] Omni appellatione remotâ.

[2] The Pall was a sort of scarf, worn by Metropolitans, and was originally nothing but a stole or scarf, brought over the shoulders,

could not be degraded by Prelates of inferior dignity. The objection, of course, was overruled. The Commissioners answered that they acted, not merely as Bishops, but as Delegates of the Pope, and were, therefore, fully competent to the execution of his orders. The rest of the insulting ceremony was accordingly completed. A barber was at hand to clip off the hair round his head. Boner then scraped the tops of the Archbishop's fingers, to signify the removal of the holy ointment with which they had been touched at his consecration: and the pageantry was concluded by the exhibition of the Primate of all England in his doublet, over which was contemptuously thrown the threadbare gown of a yeoman bedel; while Boner, unable to contain his exultation, exclaimed, "You are now no longer my Lord;" and then, pointing to him, said to the spectators, "See here this *gentleman!*"

When Cranmer was led back to prison, a spectator who had witnessed his degradation, contrived to restore to him his clerical gown, of which he had been deprived: and took that opportunity to assure him that the Bishop of Ely was a most unwilling actor in the late scene; for that, in his hearing, he had protested, with tears, that his friendship for the sufferer was undiminished. The demeanour of Thirlby had, indeed, throughout, exhibited a remarkable contrast to that of his unfeeling colleague. When Boner

and, probably, crossed, or wound, in front, so that the two ends hung down together. In the Eastern Church it is called ὠμοφόριον.

was pouring out abuse upon the fallen Primate, Thirlby had repeatedly plucked him by the sleeve, and implored him to desist; and afterwards reproached him with the breach of his promise to treat the prisoner with becoming moderation. And when Cranmer presented to him the copy of his Appeal, the Bishop addressed him in language of earnest kindness. He assured him, weeping, that nothing but the positive injunctions of the King and Queen would ever have induced him to act under a Commission against his friend; and besought him to acknowledge his errors, and throw himself on the mercy of his Sovereign. In truth, there was ample cause for all, and more than all, the emotion which was betrayed by Thirlby on this melancholy occasion. In the days of the Archbishop's prosperity, he had treated this man with all the affectionate confidence of a brother, and with all the munificence of a generous benefactor. The time had been, when Thirlby had only to admire any thing which belonged to Cranmer, and, however costly or precious it might be, he was sure to obtain it; so that it became a sort of proverbial saying, that Thirlby's commendation of any valuable article in the possession of the Primate, was a plain way of winning it[1]. No wonder, then, that when the Archbishop was told that Thirlby's regard for him was unimpaired, he should reply, "He might have shown me much more kindness, without being the worse for it; for I have well deserved it at his hand." And yet, before the day was over, this very man appears to have

[1] Morice's Account, quoted in Strype's Cranmer, b. iii. c. 36.

well nigh lost all inconvenient recollection of the benefits heaped upon him by the liberality of his patron. When Cranmer, after the agitation of the day, was almost fainting for want of food, his need was supplied by the above kind-hearted stranger, who furnished money to the bailiffs for this purpose. But the man had nearly suffered for his charitable intentions; for, before the night, his bounty had been reported to the two Commissioners, and brought upon him a severe rebuke from both of them, for having ministered to the necessities of a heretic: and it was not without some difficulty that he escaped a journey to London, to answer for his ill-timed good offices before the Council. One would willingly hope, that Thirlby was a reluctant party to this inhuman severity: but, at all events, a courageous protest against it would have been no more than a graceful and becoming manifestation of his gratitude.

His Appeal disregarded.

As might have been expected, the Appeal of Cranmer to a General Council, was left wholly unnoticed. The Pope was allowed to be a judge of his own jurisdiction, and to extinguish, with a word, all right of resistance to it. This the Archbishop probably foresaw: for a letter of his has been preserved, which he had privately addressed to a trusty friend, learned in the law, before the eighty days had elapsed; in which he urgently requests instructions relative to the form and manner of preparing and conducting such Appeal; but, at the same time, intimating his apprehension that, after all, it would never be admitted. This, however, he

said, gave him but little uneasiness. "He desired that God's will might be done, and that God's name might be glorified, either by his life or death. He thought it much better to die in Christ's quarrel, than to be shut up in the prison of the body, unless it were for the advancement of God's glory, and the profit of his brethren." These words seem to imply, that he then fully anticipated his death. and it further appears, from the express language of this letter, that his appeal was attempted chiefly as a measure of delay, which might enable him, before his execution, to complete his answer to Gardiner's last Treatise on the Sacrament[1]. But, whatever might be his own expectations, it is quite certain that his enemies were resolved on his destruction. There was no quarter to which he could look, with any hope of mercy. It is true, that the Queen had been indebted to him for her liberty, and, perhaps, even for her life: for, at one time, it was the purpose of her father to send her to the Tower, there to suffer as a subject, for her adherence to the Pope, and her disobedience to the law; and nothing but the intercession of the Archbishop could divert him from his resolution. And, when the

[1] "Potissima sanè appellationis meæ causa est, ut—(si ita Deus voluerit)—donetur eousque vivendi tempus, *quousque cœptum contrà Marcum Antonium Constantium* responsum absolvero." Letters of the Martyrs, fol. 19—23: where this letter is printed, both in Latin and English.—Miles Coverdale's note to the above passage is—"This *Constantius* was Steven Gardiner, as *constant* indeed as a *weathercock*, who thus nameth himself, writing against this good Father." Ib. fol. 22. The letter is also printed in Cranmer's Remains, vol. i. p. 384. Lett. 301.

King yielded to his persuasions, he prophetically declared that Cranmer's good offices in her behalf would, in the end, turn to his own utter confusion [1]. It, likewise, appears, that a petition had been addressed to the Queen, in the preceding year, by those that were abroad, imploring a mitigation of her rigorous dealing towards the Protestants, and more especially towards Cranmer; whose friendly interference, as they reminded her, had alone preserved her from the effects of her royal father's displeasure [2]. It can, therefore, scarcely be imagined that she was ignorant of her obligations to the man whom she was now persecuting unto death. But the recollection of his services, probably, did but render the sacrifice, in her estimation, just so much the more valuable, and consequently the more meritorious.

Up to this moment then, it appears as clear as historical evidence can make it, that the Archbishop's resolution was entirely immoveable. He had positively refused to fly from danger, when flight was in his power,—he had subsequently been worn and harassed by protracted imprisonment,—he had been worried by public and tumultuous disputations,—he had seen the furies of persecution let loose upon the Church, and his two dearest friends and colleagues dragged to the stake,—he had been degraded from his dignity and office with every mark of cowardly in-

[1] This is stated by Strype, Cranm. b. iii. c. 30, on the authority of Morice's Account of the Archbishop.

[2] Strype's Cranmer, b. iii. c. 18.

sult,—and all this he had endured with the most unflinching constancy. And if he had now been led out at once to execution, there can be no reasonable doubt that he would have *witnessed a good confession* in the flames, and have transmitted to after-ages a name unsullied with the slightest suspicion of apostasy. This, however, was a triumph, of which his adversaries were anxious to deprive the cause to which he had been invincibly faithful. They were determined on his immolation: but they were also resolved that the offering should, if possible, be so foully tainted, as to become worthless and contemptible in the sight of the Protestant Church: and it is now our melancholy task to record the partial success of their devices.

Cranmer's Recantations.

It will be recollected, then, that the degradation of the Archbishop took place on the 14th of February: and it is a most remarkable, and scarcely explicable circumstance, that no less than four different papers of submission or recantation are said to have been signed by him within two days of that event, and before he was allowed to stir from the prison of Bocardo[1]. It is further most

[1] It would be a needless interruption of the narrative to introduce into it a detailed account of all Cranmer's alleged submissions and recantations: for, whether the whole of them were executed by him, or not, it would be impossible to absolve him from the imputation of a temporary failure of Christian integrity. A full and particular exposition of these transactions, together with a statement of the mystery in which they are involved, is, therefore, reserved for the Appendix to this volume, No. 5.

extraordinary, that, of these four documents, the last is by far the least explicit and satisfactory, as a renunciation of Protestantism. It is a paper which, at this day, a Protestant might conscientiously subscribe. It amounts, in fact, to little more than a profession of belief in the Christian religion, as it had been received by the Catholic Church from the beginning.

In order to account for this circumstance, it has been conjectured that Boner (finding Cranmer too much dissatisfied with the three first papers to avow them publicly, even if he had signed them in private), drew up the fourth, in terms sufficiently equivocal to satisfy his scruples, and, at the same time, to enable his enemies to proclaim that he had professed himself a sound *Catholic*. A breach, it was hoped, might thus be made in his character for integrity, which might expose him to more effectual and vigorous assaults [1]. As we are without the means of ascertaining whether the conjecture is well founded or not, we must be content to leave this part of the subject in the obscurity which has hitherto involved it.

By whose exertions the resolution of Cranmer was first unsettled, we are not informed. He is said to have received visits of courtesy and condolence, from various distinguished members of the University, who expressed a lively interest in his fate. And it is far from unlikely that Thirlby, his former friend, may have repaired to him in prison, and have there re-

[1] See Soames's Hist. of the Reformation, vol. iv. p. 515—528.

newed those solicitations, which he had tried in vain while sitting in judgment upon him. Of the four papers which, as we are told, he was prevailed upon to sign, the first was afterwards revoked by him. This revocation was ascribed by Boner to his "inconstancy and unstableness." It was, much more probably, the consequence of representations, that the first paper would be wholly insufficient to satisfy the Government. The papers which followed it, may have been successively extorted, by similar artifices. The last of the four was, indeed, the least satisfactory. But yet it may have been transmitted to the Court, as a proof that his firmness was not wholly unassailable. At all events, the more elaborate measures of seduction, resorted to subsequently to the 16th, are quite sufficient to show, that the Romanists were dissatisfied with the success of their first attempts. The Archbishop was invited by Dr. Marshall to the Deanery of Christchurch; where he exchanged, for a time, the horrors of a dungeon, for the society of learned men, and the liberal hospitality of Collegiate life. He was allowed the recreation of his favourite game at bowls; and in the midst of these indulgences, he was plied with an insidious mixture of intimidation and encouragement. He was assured that he had the cordial good-will of the nobility; he was flattered with the prospect of recovering his former dignity, or, if he should prefer it, of passing the remainder of his days in honourable privacy; he was informed that nothing would gratify the Queen so much as his submission; but that nothing short of his submission

would satisfy her, since she was resolved either to have Cranmer a Catholic, or else no Cranmer at all; he was, finally, reminded that he still was lusty and strong, and might hope for many more years of health and comfort; and that it would, therefore, be madness to persevere inflexibly in a course, which must inevitably terminate in an agonizing and untimely death. His subscription to the words of "*one little leaf of paper*," it was suggested, might save him from this terrible extremity, and would open to him the hopes of a quiet and dignified old age[1]. By these treacherous applications, the desire of life was, gradually, revived within him; and his sinking fortitude was, probably, overthrown by the arrival of the writ for his execution, which was dated on the 24th of February, and must have reached Oxford a day or two after. The result of all these perfidious practices, it has been supposed, was his subscription to a fifth paper, which, undoubtedly, contains as plenary an assent to Popery, as they who hungered and thirsted for his disgrace, could possibly desire. This disastrously memorable document, be it remembered, was drawn up *in Latin*. It was printed immediately on its execution, as Cranmer's recantation: and it is not the least mysterious of the strange circumstances connected with these transactions, that, no sooner was the paper printed, than it was suppressed by the Council. The order for delivering up all the printed copies *to be burned*, is dated on the thirteenth of

[1] Eccl. Biog. vol. iii. p. 585—588.

March ; and on the sixteenth the printers were compelled to enter into recognizances to obey this mandate.

This fifth submission, it should be observed, is without any date, either as to place or time. But it can hardly be doubted that, if ever it was signed by Cranmer, it must have been subsequently to his removal to Christchurch Deanery ; though at what period during his residence there, or after his return to prison, it now seems impossible to ascertain. He had now, if we are to repose implicit confidence in the representations of his adversaries, declared his own unfaithfulness in language as express as even they could frame for him. But their rancour appears to have been still unsatiated. They were determined to enjoy, if possible, the vindictive delight of hearing him utter the basest notes of humiliation: for we find, among the papers ascribed to him, a *sixth* recantation, less distinct and explicit than the preceding, as a confession of the Romish faith; but most abundant and diffuse in abject expressions of self-condemnation. It has been conjectured by Strype that this outrageous, and almost bombastic, string of self-accusations, was the composition of Cardinal Pole. It certainly is very much in his style. He had drawn up, as the historian remarks, a form of recantation closely resembling it, for Sir John Cheke[1]: and it has been suggested that the same

[1] The recantation of Cheke is expressly attributed to Pole in Dudith, p. 71. Ed. 1690. And see Strype's Eccl. Mem. vol. iii. p. 395.

train of thought and expression is to be found in a manuscript letter of Pole's to Cranmer, relative to the doctrine of the Sacrament, and written shortly after the disputation at Oxford [1].

But whatever may be the obscurity which hangs over the received account of Cranmer's submission, it must, at all events, remain clear, by his own confession, that he suffered his virtue to be most unworthily tampered with, and humbled himself by a protracted course of hesitation and dissembling. Let it, however, be conceded that his weakness was, in all respects, as ignominious, as his worst enemies have ever represented it, still, the history of his fall must always occupy one of the darkest pages in the annals of Romish cruelty and cunning. Nothing can well be more astounding, than to find that any professor of the Papal Creed, at the present day, should look, without aversion and disgust, upon the steps by which he was lured into this depth of humiliation. It may be allowed, that the sincere and zealous Roman Catholics of that day might

[1] "The Latin Original is among the Harleian MSS.; and a French translation is in Le Grand, and Pole's Epistles."—Soames, Hist. Reform. vol. iv. p. 525.—This letter is alluded to by Strype, Cranmer, b. iii. c. 20.; but he has printed nothing of it but its long Latin title, which describes it as "an Epistle of the Legate to Thomas Cranmer, who, holding the See of Canterbury, had delivered a new doctrine respecting the Eucharist, contrary to the perpetual consent of the Church: in which Epistle it is shown that he is fit neither to be a teacher or a learner of that high mystery; and is exhorted to penance for his error therein."

naturally wish for the degradation, nay, even for the execution, of the Arch-heretic. But they were not content with his blood. Nothing would satisfy them but the barbarous mutilation of his good name. Their conduct towards him resembled that of an ungenerous adversary, who, having disarmed his antagonist, and smitten him to the earth, first tempts him to debase himself by words of craven supplication, then tramples him in the dust, and, at last, plunges the sword into his heart. One can scarcely imagine how any Roman Catholic gentleman of modern times can think on these things without crying shame on the men who thus disgraced their Communion. For the honour of their own party, if not for the sake of Cranmer, the Romanists should be solicitous to bury this portion of his history in everlasting oblivion [1].

We now proceed to the consideration of the Archbishop's conduct, in the closing scene of his eventful life.

[1] It has been suggested by Dr. Lingard that the tale of Cranmer having been seduced into recantation, is negatived by his last speech; since "he there makes no such apology for himself, but owns that his confessions proceeded *from his wish to save his life.*" Unquestionably they proceeded *from his wish to save his life!* But by whom, and by what means, were his love of life, and his fear of death, recalled into action? It is an utterly vain attempt to resist the current of historical testimony, which furnishes the answer to this question. They who are desirous of access to all the authorities, by which the fact of Cranmer's temptation is established, will do well to consult Soames's Hist. Reform. vol. iv. p. 514, note (c).

The sixth paper of submission was dated on the 18th of March. It contained a prayer for mercy; and the answer to this petition was an order for his almost immediate execution. From the very first, it had been determined that he should suffer as a heretic; but his enemies waited awhile, that they might fix upon him the infamy of cowardice and unfaithfulness; and when artifice and temptation had done their worst, the fire was speedily lighted for his destruction. By way of preparation for the solemnity, the Provost of Eton College, Dr. Cole, had secret instructions from the Queen to prepare a sermon for the occasion: and lest the feelings of the people should break out into violence and tumult, many of the neighbouring gentry and magistrates were assembled in Oxford, with their servants and retainers, to keep the peace, and witness the execution.

Order for Cranmer's Execution.

On the 20th of March, the day before he suffered, the Archbishop was visited in his prison by Dr. Cole, and interrogated by him, whether he continued firm in the Catholic faith, as he had recently professed it? The answer of Cranmer was somewhat equivocal. He said that, by God's Grace, he would be still more confirmed in the *Catholic* faith; a reply which most probably intimated that he had begun to repent of his weakness, and to form a resolution to return to the profession which he had seemingly abandoned. How the interval between that time and the day after was passed by him, we have no certain information; but it is at least likely, that it was employed in

Is visited in prison by Cole and Garcina.

preparing the prayer, the exhortation, and the repentant confession of apostasy, which were actually delivered by him immediately before his execution[1]. On the next day, Saturday, the 21st of March, he was again visited by Cole at an early hour, and asked by him whether he was provided with money. Being answered in the negative, Cole supplied him with fifteen crowns,—an indirect, but very intelligible mode of apprizing him, that he must prepare for death;—it being, then, a sort of funereal custom for persons condemned to die, to distribute alms among the people. This intimation must, in all likelihood, have dissipated every hope of mercy, and have convinced him that the time was come for publicly abjuring the dissimulation, which had wounded his conscience and his fame, without preserving his life. Some time after Cole had retired, the Friar Garcina made his appearance in the prison, and urgently besought him to transcribe a retractation of his doctrine, to be delivered by him at the stake. It is uncertain whether the document thus tendered to him was the *fifth* of the submissions ascribed to him in Boner's printed account, but which, as we have seen, had been hitherto suppressed by the Council,—or whether (which is the more probable supposition,) it was nothing more than the brief revocation of his doctrine respecting the Eucharist, which, in the printed account of his submissions, is called " the saying of Thomas Cranmer, a little before his death[2]." But, however this may be, it

[1] Gilpin, p. 207. [2] See Appendix, No. 5.

appears that Cranmer consented to transcribe it, and thus to leave the Friar under the impression that it was his intention to deliver it before the public, when he came to execution. In this, undoubtedly, there was some appearance of deception;, but it was an expedient to which he was almost driven by the necessity of the case. He well knew, that if he had *then* rejected the proposed paper, and had apprized Garcina of his design to revoke his former submissions, he never would have been allowed to address the bystanders for that purpose, and would thus have perished under the imputation of impenitent apostasy. But though he consented to transcribe the Friar's document, there is no reason whatever to believe that he ever set his name to it; for the seventh paper attributed to him in Boner's printed statement[1], appears there, unlike the other six, without the signature of *Thomas Cranmer;* although the account affirms that it was written with his own hand. It may therefore be reasonably concluded, that he agreed to transcribe it purely for the purpose of ridding himself of the Friar's solicitations, and of thus securing an opportunity of proclaiming his repentance before he died.

21st March, 1556. Cranmer taken to St. Mary's previously to his Execution.

The facility afforded him for this public confession was, accidentally, beyond his hopes. Between nine and ten o'clock on the 21st of March, the Lord Williams, with others of the neighbouring gentry, arrived in Oxford for the purpose of presiding at the sacrifice of the reclaimed Arch-heretic. The morning,

[1] See Appendix, No. 5.

however, happened to be so rainy, that, instead of conducting him at once to the stake, they brought him to St. Mary's Church, in the full expectation that he would there complete the triumph of the Romanists, by proclaiming, with his dying breath, his adhesion to their communion. On his way thither he was placed between two Friars, whose office it was to murmur out certain psalms, which, it was conceived, were appropriate to his mournful situation. On his entrance into the Church, the *Nunc Dimittis* was chanted; and the Archbishop was then led forward to a scaffolding, or platform, raised in front of the pulpit. When he had ascended it, he knelt down to pray; and wept so bitterly, that many of the spectators were, also, moved to tears; more especially those among them "who had conceived an assured hope of his conversion and repentance."

Proceedings at St. Mary's.

Dr. Cole then commenced his sermon; in which he stated that Dr. Cranmer had been the prime agent in all the pernicious changes, by which the realm had been for so many years distracted. He had usurped the office of pronouncing the Divorce between Henry VIII. and Queen Catherine; and though he might have been impelled rather by the persuasions of other men, than by any malicious motive, yet he had thus become the chief author of all the confusion that had followed. He had, moreover, not only been the notorious patron of all the heresies which had burst into the kingdom, but had persisted in maintaining them, both by disputation and by writing: and so long a perseverance

in error had never, but in time of schism, been pardoned by the Church. The preacher also stated, that, in addition to these causes for Cranmer's execution, the Queen and her Council were moved by certain other reasons, which it would not be fit or convenient to disclose.

Having next exhorted the bystanders to profit by the melancholy example before them, Dr. Cole addressed his discourse to Cranmer himself. He reminded the prisoner of the mercy of God, who will not suffer us to be tempted beyond what we are able to bear; expressed a good hope that he would, like the penitent thief, be that day with Christ in Paradise; encouraged him to meditate on the deliverance of the three children, to whom God made the flame seem like a pleasant dew; on the rejoicing of St. Andrew in his Cross, and the patience of St. Laurence on the fire; and assured him, that if, in his extremity, he should call on God, and on such as have died in his faith, he would either abate the fury of the flame, or else would give the sufferer strength to endure it. He gloried in the final conversion of Cranmer to the truth, which could only be regarded as the work of God; and concluded with many expressions of commendation, and with a promise that Masses should be sung for his soul at every church in Oxford.

Cranmer's demeanour.

Having finished his sermon, the preacher desired that all who were present would offer up their supplications for the prisoner. On this, Cranmer himself immediately knelt down in secret prayer. His example was followed by the

rest of the congregation. They all of them prayed together, as by one consent. Those among them who once hated him as an incorrigible heretic, were now melted by the spectacle of his repentance; while others who loved him before, were yet unable suddenly to hate him, and fondly clung to the hope that, after all, he would return to his former profession, and make a public acknowledgment of his fall. This general feeling of compassion had been powerfully heightened by the appearance of the Archbishop during the sermon. He had stood before the people the very image of sorrow; his face bathed in tears, his eyes sometimes raised to heaven in hope, sometimes cast down to the earth for shame, but still preserving throughout a venerable aspect, and quiet solemnity of demeanour.

When his silent devotions were concluded, Cranmer rose from his knees, and turning towards the people, heartily thanked them for their prayers. He then said, "I will now pray for myself, as I could best devise for my own comfort, and say the prayer, word for word, as I have here written it;" and remaining still on his feet, he recited from his manuscript the following supplication:—

"O Father of Heaven: O Son of God, Redeemer of the world; O Holy Ghost, proceeding from them both, three persons and one God, have mercy upon me most wretched caitiff, and miserable sinner. I, who have offended both Heaven and earth, and more grievously than any tongue can express, whither then may I go, or whither should I fly for succour? To

Heaven I may be ashamed to lift up mine eyes; and in earth I find no refuge. What shall I then do? Shall I despair? God forbid. O good God, Thou art merciful, and refusest none that come unto Thee for succour. To Thee therefore do I run. To Thee do I humble myself: saying, O Lord God, my sins be great, but yet have mercy upon me for Thy great mercy. O God the Son, thou wast not made man, this great mystery was not wrought for few or small offences. Nor thou didst not give thy Son unto death, O God the Father, for our little and small sins only, but for all the greatest sins of the world; so that the sinner return unto thee with a penitent heart; as I do here at this present. Wherefore have mercy upon me, O Lord, whose property is always to have mercy. For although my sins be great, yet Thy mercy is greater. I crave nothing, O Lord, for mine own merits, but for Thy Name's sake, that it may be glorified thereby: and for thy dear Son Jesus Christ's sake."

Having finished this act of devotion he knelt down, and repeated the Lord's Prayer, all the congregation on their knees, devoutly joining him. Then, rising on his feet once more, he addressed a solemn exhortation to the people, in which he warned them that *the love of this world is hatred against God;* enjoined them to remain in willing and cheerful obedience to the King and Queen; besought them to live together like brethren and sisters; and, lastly, entreated the wealthy to lay up in their hearts the saying of our Lord, *It is hard for a rich man to enter into heaven;*

and also the words of St. John,—"*Whoso hath this world's goods, and seeth his brother have need, and shutteth up his bowels of compassion from him, how dwelleth the love of God in him*[1] *?*" He then continued his address to the people, in the following memorable words:—

"And now forsomuch as I am come to the last end of my life, whereupon hangeth all my life passed, and my life to come, either to live with my Saviour Christ in heaven, in joy, or else to be in pain ever with wicked devils in hell; and I see before mine eyes presently either heaven ready to receive me, or hell ready to swallow me up; I shall therefore declare unto you my very faith, how I believe, without colour or dissimulation. For now is no time to dissemble, whatsoever I have written in times past.

"First, I believe in God the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth, &c. and every article of the Catholic faith, every word and sentence taught by our Saviour Christ, his Apostles and Prophets, in the Old and New Testament.

"And now I come to the great thing that troubleth my conscience more than any other thing that ever I said or did in my life: and that is, the setting abroad *of writings contrary to the truth. Which here now I renounce, and refuse, as things written with my hand contrary to the truth which I thought in my heart, and writ for fear of*

He retracts his Recantation.

[1] This exhortation was rendered very appropriate by the severe scarcity then prevalent at Oxford.

death, and to save my life, if it might be: and that is, all such bills, which I have written or signed with mine own hand, since my degradation; wherein I have written many things untrue. And forasmuch as my hand offended in writing contrary to my heart, therefore my hand shall first be punished. For if I may come to the fire, it shall be first burned. And as for the Pope, I refuse him, as Christ's enemy and Antichrist, with all his false doctrine."

The amazement and confusion of the assembly at the utterance of this speech, may very easily be imagined. All his judges, and doubtless a very large portion of the audience, expected nothing from his lips but an open and penitent abjuration of his Protestant opinions. Instead of this, he proclaimed that he had nothing to repent of but his unworthy professions of the Romish faith. It was to no purpose that Lord Williams vehemently reminded him of his submission and dissembling, and exhorted him to remember himself, and play the Christian man. The Archbishop remained unshaken. "Alas! my Lord," was his reply, "I have been a man that, all my life, loved plainness, and never dissembled till now against the truth, which I am most sorry for; and I cannot better play the Christian man than by speaking the truth, as I now do." He further protested that, with regard to the doctrine of the Sacrament, he still believed precisely as he had written in his book against the Bishop of Winchester.

By this time the exasperation of the Romanists had become outrageous. The assembly broke up, and

the Archbishop was hurried to the place of execution. On his way thither, one of the Friars, foaming with rage and disappointment, assailed him with reproaches for his inconstancy, and bade him remember his recantation; repeatedly crying out, "Was it not thy own doing[1]?" On his arrival at the stake, he put off his garments with alacrity, and even with haste, and stood upright in his shirt. When his caps were taken off, his head appeared so bare that not a single hair could be discerned upon it. His beard, however, was long and thick, and his countenance altogether of such reverend gravity, that neither friend nor foe could look upon it without emotion. While the preparations for his death were completing, a Bachelor of Divinity, accompanied by two Spanish Friars, made one desperate effort to recall him to his apostasy. But their attempts were utterly fruitless. The Archbishop was only moved to repeat, that he sorely repented of his recantation, because he knew it was contrary to the truth. On this the friars said, in Latin, to each other,—"Let us leave him to himself; the Devil is surely with him, and we ought no longer to be near him." Lord Williams became impatient of further delay, and ordered the proceedings to be *cut short*. Cranmer, therefore, took his surrounding friends by the hand, and bade them his last farewell; while his defeated monitor, the Bachelor, indignantly rebuked them for touching the heretic, and protested that he was bitterly sorry for having come into his company.

Is hurried to Execution.

[1] *Nonne fecisti.* Foxe.

He could not forbear, however, once more, to urge his adherence to his recantation. The answer of Cranmer was—" This is the hand that wrote it, and therefore it shall first suffer punishment."

His demeanour at the stake.

The fire was, now, speedily kindled; and Cranmer immediately made good his words, by thrusting his right hand into the flame. He held it there, with unflinching steadiness, exclaiming, from time to time—" This hand hath offended,—this unworthy hand!" So immoveable was his fortitude, that the spectators could plainly perceive the fire consuming his hand, before it had materially injured any other part of his frame. At last, the pile became completely lighted, and then the fire soon did its work upon him. To the very last, his resolution continued firm. When the flames mounted, so that he was almost enveloped by them, he appeared to move no more than the stake to which he was bound. His eyes, all the while, were stedfastly raised towards heaven; and, so long as the power of utterance remained, his swollen tongue was repeatedly heard to exclaim, " This unworthy hand!—Lord Jesus, receive my spirit."

That Cranmer's " patience in the torment, and courage in dying," were worthy of the noblest cause, is amply and generously attested by the Roman Catholic spectator[1] who has left us an account of his last sufferings. " If," says the writer of that narrative, " it had been, either for the glory of God, the

[1] Our narrative of the martyrdom has been taken, partly from the martyrology; but chiefly, from the description of it contained in a letter from a Roman Catholic *eye-witness* to a friend;

wealth of his country, or the testimony of the truth, —as it was for a pernicious error, and subversion of true religion,—I could worthily have commended the example, and matched it with the fame of any Father of ancient time." There is a sort of traditional story that, after he was burnt, his heart was found unconsumed in the midst of the ashes. The tale is scarcely worth repeating. It is, indeed, just possible, that when the flames had nearly consumed the parts more immediately exposed to their action, the heart may have been separated from the body; and may have accidentally fallen upon a spot, where the fire was less fierce: and there it may have been found, comparatively uninjured, or, at least, in a state which might enable a spectator to distinguish it. And this may have given birth to a report, which credulity or superstition might exalt into a miracle [1].

dated March 23. 1556, and printed, from Foxe's MSS., by Strype, Cranmer, b. iii. c. 21.

[1] This story is omitted in the later editions of Foxe. But it seems to have been so implicitly credited by Strype, that he expresses his regret that the heart, which the fire had left inviolate, was not preserved in an urn! Strype's Cranmer, b. iii. c. 21.

With his usual minuteness of detail, Strype has given us the following items of the charge for the burning of Cranmer:

	s.	*d.*	
For an hundred of wood-faggots .	6	0	Ibid.
For an hundred of half furze-faggots	3	4	
For the carriage of them	0	8	
For two labourers	1	4	

From which we learn, that the burning of a heretic usually cost the public about 11*s.* 4*d.*

Reflections on his fate.

Thus perished Archbishop Cranmer;—a man, to whom the obligations of this country must ever be "broad and deep:" for to his conscientious labours, and incomparable prudence and moderation, we are, under Providence, mainly indebted for the present fabric of our Protestant Church. The brightness of his last hour was preceded, it is true, by an awful interval of darkness. The shadows, however, most happily passed away from him; and his name resumed its lustre in the midst of the fires of his martyrdom. The revival of his courage was the bitterest of all imaginable disappointments to the Romish party. The final prostration of his integrity would, to them, have been a great and inestimable spoil. So blind was the impatience of the Church of Rome for the ruin of his fame, that it drove her to a prodigal application of her customary craft, such as must have tended only to the defeat of her purpose. She trod upon the victim whom she had allured into her toils, till his heart must have revolted against her perfidious cruelty. She thus, in effect, laboured unconsciously, to rekindle the slumbering fires of his faith and virtue, and to defraud herself of the satisfaction of utterly murdering his reputation, before she consigned his body to torture and to death. Whether she might, at the last, have spared his life, and yet have been, eventually, gratified with his blood, is, indeed, a question which none can certainly determine, except Him who searcheth the heart. But yet, if he is to be *judged of man's judgment*, it seems impossible to believe that he could

long have endured the miseries of a dishonoured and despised old age. It appears, that, all along, he was smitten with remorse and horror for yielding to the recoil of flesh and blood. He protested, just before his death, that " he had oft repented him of his recantation ;" and the truth of this saying is irresistibly established by his whole demeanour in his last agony, as represented to us by his honest and candid " Roman Catholic reporter." And when we look at his self-possession and alacrity at the stake, and recollect, at the same time, his constitutional defect of firmness,—nothing can well be thought of more surprising, than the heroism of his last hour. It has, indeed, been sometimes alleged, that he derived courage to retract, *only* from his despair of pardon. But his despair of pardon never can have inspired him with invincible fortitude, while the flames were devouring his flesh. His courage in the midst of sufferings (which might well extort groans, even from men made of more stubborn stuff than Cranmer), can never have been the effect of hypocrisy and dissimulation. It is impossible that he could be merely playing a part, when he held his hand immoveably in the fire that was scorching every nerve and sinew, and accused that hand as the guilty instrument of his disgrace. We have here, at least, a substantial proof that, at that moment, all anguish was light, compared with the agony of his deep, but not despairing repentance. And justice demands of us, further, to keep in mind, that the language in which his penitence was proclaimed, relates wholly to his

recent course of dissimulation. With regard to every other act of his life, he expresses himself, throughout his persecution, like one who had exercised himself to have a conscience void of offence towards God and man.

In a word, then, we have seen Archbishop Cranmer, in his last moments, surrounded, as it were, by the ruins of his own good fame; and yet, in the midst of that piteous wreck, enabled to resume his courage, and to rise, like the Apostle who denied his Lord, from the depths of human frailty, to the honours of Christian martyrdom. It is scarcely to be credited that a man like this could have borne to live "infamous and contented," if the Church of Rome had allowed him to survive. Had his life been granted him, he must soon have loathed a gift, which would only have reserved him for sufferings worse than the bitterness of death. He might then, possibly, have sunk under the silent, though inglorious martyrdom, of a wounded spirit: but, more probably, he would have been enabled to *renew his strength*, and to seek a refuge from his anguish, by rushing, a voluntary martyr, into the flames.

CHAPTER XVII.

Review of Cranmer's Character—Some general Reflections on the Reformation in England.

If any one were to derive his knowledge of Archbishop Cranmer solely from the foregoing narrative, he would possibly rise from the perusal without any impression seriously unfavourable to his character for integrity and fortitude. And yet I am utterly unconscious of having wilfully mis-stated any fact in his history, or disguised the moral complexion of the man by artificial colouring. It may be asked, then, how is it that the individual represented in these pages, should have been stigmatised, always by Romanists, and occasionally by Protestants, as a time-server, and a courtier,—a man destitute, not only of mere animal courage, but of high moral principle?

The acrimony of the Romanists towards the memory of Cranmer may reasonably be viewed with some little indulgence. His life was devoted to the subversion of their greatness. In their judgment, therefore, his very virtues would be transformed into failings, and his failings would be aggravated into vices. For the faint and penurious praise which is occasionally dealt out to his memory by Protestants of later times, it may be more difficult to account. Still less explicable is the positive rancour with

which his name has, in some instances, been recently assailed. Possibly this may, in part, be a natural effect of that reaction which often follows an unqualified vehemence of admiration. The Archbishop was so distinguished a benefactor to the Protestant cause, that his reputation was long identified with it. The veneration entertained for him by the Reformers and their successors was, sometimes, well nigh unbounded and indiscriminate. To him it was, that the Church of England principally stood indebted for her sound and moderate doctrines, her impressive services, and her incomparable forms of devotion. To think of the faults of such a man would seem a breach of charity, and, almost, of gratitude. To exalt his services and his virtues would be only to speak the language of fidelity to the establishment of which he was regarded as the founder. Such was the state of feeling respecting Cranmer in the earlier days of the Reformation. In our own times, it seems to have been thought necessary to correct the suavity of former commendations, by an extraordinary infusion of bitterness. Every failing has been dragged forth and placed in the most trying point of view. Every excellence, and every merit, has been invidiously suppressed or perverted. A sinister and repulsive expression has been given to every feature of his character; so that it would be scarcely possible for any one, incompetently versed in his history, to rise from the contemplation of the picture, without unmixed feelings of aversion and contempt!

As the office I have undertaken is that of a chro-

nicler, rather than an advocate, I shall dwell no longer on these forcible distortions of the truth. The cause of the Archbishop is safe in the hands of every intelligent reader, who will but dispassionately examine the incidents of his life, and the peculiar circumstances in which he was fated to act. I shall, accordingly, be content to adopt the language of the honest and indefatigable Strype, in the full confidence that it will commend itself to every impartial understanding, and to every kindly and generous spirit. "I do not intend these my collections for such a panegyric of him, as to make the world believe him void of all faults and frailties, the condition of human nature. He lived in such critical times, and under such Princes, and was necessarily involved in such affairs, as exposed him to greater temptations than ordinary. And if any blemishes shall by curious observers be espied in him, he may therefore seem the more pardonable; and his *great and exemplary goodness and usefulness in the Church of God* may make amends for some errors."

The reader will easily have collected from the whole tenor of the Archbishop's life, that it was not so much for an "unconquerable will" and stern inflexibility of purpose, that Cranmer challenges the homage of posterity, as for eminent wisdom and caution; for sober, patient, unwearied, and conscientious inquiries after Christian truth; and for the steady perseverance with which he sought its advancement. It is tolerably clear that his peculiar temperament was never designed for a fierce and angry struggle with

the bad passions of other men. It might, therefore, have been happy for him, had he been allowed to serve his country and his God, as a retired scholar and divine, instead of being forced up into the region of whirlwinds and tempests, and constantly exposed to dangers almost too formidable for any but the most heroic resolution. Even among those who are least disposed to regard him with veneration, some have been willing to allow that his faults were the result, not of evil design, but of the circumstances in which he was placed. But then it is contended, on the other hand, that he was placed in the midst of those circumstances by his own voluntary act; and can therefore be entitled to little benefit from a consideration of his difficulties. Now, when it is affirmed that Cranmer voluntarily placed himself in this arduous post, nothing more can be meant than this—that he did not persist, to the last, in opposing the resolution of his Sovereign to fix him there. Of course, he did not become Primate of England by positive compulsion; but it is still indisputable that the power and influence exerted to raise him to that dignity were all but irresistible. And that he mounted, with bitter reluctance, to his dangerous elevation, is absolutely certain; unless we are to fix the note of falsehood on his own solemn asseveration to that effect before the Commissioners at Oxford.

Of the perils that surrounded him, no correct notion can be formed by us, without recollecting that he lived in days of violence, and almost of semi-barbarism;—in an age when the gates of destruction

stood wide open, night and day, ready to swallow up all intractable integrity, and when the art of self-preservation was pretty sure to be promoted nearly to the rank of a cardinal virtue. It must require an iron fortitude, an adamantine force of character, combined with higher principles, to bear a man uniformly and stiffly up against the trials incident to such a situation. The fatality which, at a period like this, placed Cranmer in a Court, especially in such a Court as that of Henry, must have been most unfavourable to his quiet and his happiness. His condition there, resembled that of a man shut up with a half-tame lion, which, though it might, for the most part, be tractable and gentle, might yet, at any moment, be ready to fly upon him, and tear him to pieces. During the rest of his days,—in the reign of Edward, and in that of Mary,—he was surrounded by licentious courtiers, profligate statesmen, and secret or open enemies. He was living, as it were, in a menagerie of untamed beasts, exposed every hour to the impurity and the violence of the capricióus savages. A more inauspicious and comfortless position for human virtue cannot easily be imagined. And the chief subject of astonishment is, that he should have been able to hold on his way, with so steady a course, and for so great a length of time, in spite of such manifold embarrassment and danger. Among the secondary causes of his safety and his success we must assuredly reckon the native composure and serenity of his temper. It is clear, from his whole history, that he was not easily irritated or ruffled.

A letter of his to Cromwell, which has been recently made public, shows, not only that he was usually a stranger to violent emotion, but that he himself was conscious of this peculiarity [1]. "*I was ever hitherto cold,*" he says, "but now I am in a heat with the cause of religion, which goeth contrary to all expectation, if it be as the fame goeth." This was written in April, 1536. What are the specific discouragements alluded to, does not appear. But the temper which he here ascribes to himself never appears to have been changed by all his subsequent trials and difficulties. Had it been otherwise, he must have been soon destroyed by the wear of his incessant anxiety and toil. As it was, the unimpassioned sedateness of his nature achieved, in a considerable measure, for him, what the *momentum* of a more energetic character sometimes fails to accomplish. It enabled him to go forward against all impediments with a moderate, even, and incessant pressure. The hindrances might frequently be powerful enough to stop him. But they never could exhaust his patience. The moment they were removed or relaxed, the pressure was still in action, to carry him forward again.

It has been often supposed that the passive disposition of Cranmer betrayed him into criminal pliability on Ecclesiastical and religious matters, and that he varied with all the fluctuations of the Royal

[1] Cranmer's Remains, vol. i. p 162. Letter 168, dated 22nd April, 1536.

conscience. Of this the reader must form his own judgment from an attentive survey of the facts above related. To me the charge appears, to say the least, most unaccountably exaggerated. For instance—his views respecting the unlawful and incestuous character of Henry's union with his brother's widow,—and his opinions relative to the Ecclesiastical supremacy of the Crown,—may have been sound, or they may have been unsound. But, however this may be, it would be difficult to produce any reason for believing that his profession of those views and opinions was insincere and hypocritical. There is nothing in his history which warrants the presumption that his notions on these subjects were adopted or maintained for the purpose of winning or preserving the favour of the King. With regard to these questions, his mind appears to have been pretty well made up previously to his introduction to Henry: and it should always be borne in mind that, up to the hour of his last weakness, he maintained these opinions, for better for worse, through good report and evil report; that he was true to them, not only while they made him the man whom the King delighted to honour, but when they laid him open to the vengeance of the Queen, and to the malice of her Papal Counsellors. The long letter whic he addressed to Mary, after his final examination at Oxford, is an indestructible monument of his integrity in this matter. His arguments against the Supremacy of the Pope are there put forth with as much uncompromising freedom, as if the Sovereign

upon the throne were impatient to be furnished with reasons for casting away the cords and fetters of the Romish domination.

It must be needless to remind the reader of his inflexible opposition to the Statute of the Six Articles, and of his noble refusal to absent himself from the debates upon that question, in spite of a request to that effect from the King himself. Neither will it be forgotten that, while Cromwell was in the Tower, awaiting his doom, and the Romish party imagined themselves triumphant, the Archbishop stubbornly withstood their attempts to promulgate a Romish summary of doctrine; and that he did this at the imminent peril of incurring the King's mortal displeasure, who was then notoriously under the influence of that faction. In the same spirit of honest importunity, he persevered, to the latest hour of Henry's life, in extorting from his reluctant Sovereign a series of subordinate concessions, which, perhaps, when separately considered, were of little vital importance,—but which, nevertheless, were unquestionably valuable, as indications that the breath of life was still in the cause. And these efforts of the Primate are the more meritorious, as they were made in defiance of the sinister predominance of Gardiner, and in opposition not only to the personal wishes, but, apparently, to the political interests of the Monarch.

To accumulate all the proofs of Cranmer's integrity, in prosecuting the Reformation of abuses and corruptions, would be to recapitulate the history of his life. But there is one instance of his uncourtly firm-

ness too remarkable to be passed over here. It will be recollected that the "Bishops' Book" was put forth in 1536, without the authority of the King. It seems, however, that, some time after this Formulary was published, it was in contemplation to convert it into a "King's Book;" that is, to send out another impression of it under the sanction of his Majesty himself. To this measure Henry was unwilling to commit himself, without a personal revision of the work: a task which he accordingly undertook. When his corrections were completed, they were submitted by him to the judgment of Cranmer. These corrections have very recently been brought to light, and have been printed together with the annotations of the Archbishop[1]: and they furnish an additional and

[1] See Cranmer's Remains, vol. ii. p. 21—97. Previously to the appearance of this truly valuable publication, it was imagined by some writers, that Cranmer's annotations relate immediately to the "Bishops' Book" of 1536; and by others, that they relate to the "King's Book" of 1543; and this latter supposition appears, at first sight, to be countenanced by the fact, that Cranmer's remarks are entitled "Annotations on the *King's Book.*" But it now seems clear, that these annotations were made, neither on the "Bishops' Book,"—nor on the "King's Book," properly so called; but on the King's corrections of the "Bishops' Book," made by him when it was in contemplation to republish that Formulary with the Royal sanction. The criticisms of the Archbishop are termed by him "Annotations on the *King's Book,*" merely because it was then intended that the "Bishops' Book" should re-appear, and be "set forth by his Grace's censure and judgment." See his Letter to Cromwell, Remains, vol. i. p. 227. The date assigned to this Letter by the Editor is Jan. 25, 1538. See also the Editor's Preface, p. 18, 19.

most cogent evidence, to show that Cranmer did not suffer the edge of his criticism to be blunted by a servile reverence for the Royal commentator. It will be found, on examination of these papers, that both the theology and the grammar of his Majesty are there subjected to an unsparing and unceremonious dissection. It is true that the Letter to Cromwell, which accompanied his remarks, is conceived in the courtly phrase, which might reasonably enough be expected on such an occasion. "I trust," he says, "that the King's Highness will pardon my presumption, that I have been so scrupulous, and, as it were, a picker of quarrels to his Grace's Book, making a great matter of every light fault, or rather where no fault is at all; which I only do for this intent, that, because the Book shall now be set forth by his Grace's censure and judgment, I would have nothing therein that Momus could reprehend: and yet I refer all mine annotations again to his Grace's most exact judgment[1]." Language like this, addressed to a Royal person is, at all times, little more than formulary. At all events, it could never be sufficient, of itself, to take out the sting of that caustic freedom, with which the Archbishop had scrutinized the performance of his Majesty, and which was singularly hazardous, when practised upon one who had entered the lists against Luther, and was swelling with his recent titles of Defender of the Faith, and Supreme Head of the National Church[2]. They who are im-

[1] See Cranmer's Remains, vol. i. p. 227.

[2] Every one knows that, next to his prerogative, Henry valued

pressed with the popular notions of Cranmer's flexibility, and Henry's tyranny and dogmatism, would have anticipated a very different result. They would have expected, on the one hand, that the Primate would have submissively abstained from any violation of the Royal commentaries; or, on the other, that the King would have imperiously resented this interference with his judgment. The actual event was alike honourable to both parties. Cranmer examined the work of his Sovereign with the free-spoken integrity which became a Christian Bishop: and the King endured his honesty with a candour which might have befitted the most obscure Divine.

his theological and literary reputation. And it must be allowed that he and his divines were, between them, at no inconsiderable pains to maintain it. A Latin letter has recently been published from Cranmer to Wolfgang Capito, which contains the following account of his Majesty's method of forming his judgment of the books that were sent him: "It is the custom of the King, (who is extremely keen, and has a watchful eye for all things,) to deliver books that are offered to him,—especially such as he has not patience to read,—to other persons for their perusal. He then thrusts the same works into the hands of other persons of a judgment directly opposite to that of the former referee. Having thus *fished out* the whole substance of the volume, and ascertained what each party may have found to praise or blame, he at last produces his own judgment on the whole. And thus, as I understand, has been done with respect to your book."—Cranmer's Remains, vol. i. p. 192. Lett. 186, printed from a copy of the Zurich MS. The book in question was a work of W. Capito, on the Mass, Matrimony, and the power of Magistrates respecting Religion, and it was inscribed to the King; who, as Cranmer adds, greatly approved many things in Capito's treatise, but was quite unable to digest certain others.

Many of the most important of the Primate's suggestions were, indeed, rejected in the subsequent Formulary, called the "King's Book[1]," through the predominance of the Romish party. But it does not appear that his attempt to maintain the truth exposed him to the slightest displeasure from his Master.

It has further been alleged, that Cranmer acquiesced in all the changes that were made in compliance with the will of Henry, even when adverse to the cause of the Reformation. He acquiesced, undoubtedly, if submission to the law is to be designated as acquiescence. But in so doing he acted, not in obedience to the suggestions of a slavish and cowardly temper, but in conformity with a principle which governed him throughout his life. Like the moderate and amiable Tonstal, he imagined that private opinion should never lift itself up against the

[1] Some of the principal instances, in which either Henry's corrections, or Cranmer's annotations, seem to have been afterwards adopted in the composition of the real "King's Book," of 1543, may be found in Cranmer's Remains, vol. ii. p. 96, *note*.

Of the turmoil and labour with which the "Bishops' Book" had been prepared, we may form some notion from a Letter in the State Papers to Cromwell, from old Latimer,—who protests that he would rather be the "poor parson of poor Kynton again," than continue Bishop of Worcester, on condition of having any more concern in such doings! And he declares, that if there be any thing good in the Book, the chief praise will be due to the Archbishop. See Cranmer's Remains, vol. i. p. 187, 188, *note*. It is also certain that Cranmer was among the principal directors in the compilation of the "King's Book" of 1543, though his influence was not then paramount. See Ib. Editor's Preface, p. 38.

supreme authority of the State. As a Counsellor and a Peer of Parliament, he did his duty fearlessly. But when once his advice was overborne by the Legislature, he conceived that nothing remained for a subject, but submission. So exalted were his notions of the supremacy of the civil power, even in Ecclesiastial matters, that, in a later age, they would certainly have fixed upon him the imputation of *Erastianism.* Whether his principles were defensible or not, is a totally distinct question. But it is quite indisputable that his opinions on this point continued uniform and unaltered to the end of his days. That this was so, is manifest from his Letter to Queen Mary, in 1553, in which he deprecates her displeasure for having consented to the will of Edward VI., for altering the succession. In the conclusion of that address, it will be recollected, he solicits permission to "write his mind to her Majesty, concerning the estate of religion:" and he adds,—"I will never, God willing, be author of sedition, to move subjects from the obedience of their heads and rulers; which is an offence most detestable. If I have uttered my mind to your Majesty, being a Christian Queen and Governor of this realm, then I shall think myself discharged. *For it lieth not in me, but in your Grace only, to see the Reformation of things that be amiss. To private subjects it appertaineth not to reform things, but quietly to suffer what they cannot amend.* Yet, nevertheless, to show your Majesty my mind, in things appertaining unto God, methink it my duty, knowing that I do, and con-

sidering the place which, in times past, I have occupied. Yet will I not presume thereunto, without your Grace's pleasure first known, and your licence obtained [1]." Sentiments like these will, of course, find but slender patronage at the present day. But such sentiments were by no means uncommon three centuries ago; and, whatever may be their merits or demerits, there is no good reason for believing that they were otherwise than conscientiously adopted by Archbishop Cranmer.

It must further be remembered, that Cranmer appears to have been deeply sensible throughout, that the despotism of Henry, capricious as it might be, was, on the whole, a most valuable instrument for the advancement of the Reformation. He was convinced that nothing short of an almost irresistible prerogative would be powerful enough to accomplish an effectual suppression of abuses. That such was his persuasion, may be clearly collected from a conversation held by him with his secretary Morice, about the time of King Edward's visitation, in which he did not hesitate to avow, that he considered the death of Henry as a great misfortune to the Protestant cause. The King seems at that time to have been cordially disposed, not only to a correction of more insignificant corruptions, but to an abolition of the greater enormities of the Romish Church. He had actually given orders for the preparation of a Form to that effect, for the consideration of the French King, with

[1] Cranmer's Remains, vol. i. p. 362, 363.

a view to its being likewise submitted to the Emperor. And nothing diverted him from the project, but the apprehensions excited by Gardiner that it would be injurious to the political views and designs of his Majesty, by preventing the completion of a league, which he was then negociating between England, France, and the Emperor. "I had not myself thought," says the Archbishop, "that the King was so forward in those matters as then appeared. I may tell you, that it passed the pulling down of Roods, and suppressing the ringing of Bells. I take it, that few in England would have believed that the King's Majesty and the French King had been at this point, not only within half a year after to have changed the Mass into a Communion, (as we now use it), but also utterly to have extirped and banished the Bishop of Rome, and his usurped power, out of both their realms and dominions." And when the Secretary represented that the accession of Edward furnished a still more favourable opportunity for completing such designs,—"Not so," replied the Archbishop; "it was better to attempt such reformation in Henry the Eighth's days than at this time, the King being in his infancy. *For if the King's Father had set forth any thing for the reformation of abuses, who was he that durst gainsay it?* Marry, we are now in doubt how men will take the change or alteration of abuses in the Church; and therefore the Council hath forborne especially to speak thereof, and of other things, which gladly they would have reformed in this visitation; referring all those, and such like matters, to the dis-

cretion of the Visitors. But if King Henry VIII. had lived unto this day with the French King, it would have been past my Lord of Winchester's power to have visored the King's Highness, as he did when he was about the same league[1]." This passage is extremely valuable and important: for it proves, beyond all reasonable doubt, that in Cranmer's estimation, the Royal Supremacy was something more than a golden image, which he was at all times prepared to fall down and worship. He regarded it, rather, as the most effective auxiliary that Providence could place at his disposal, for the establishment of pure religion, and the restoration of the Church of England to her rightful independence.

With respect to other sacrifices of principle imputed to Cranmer, little need be said beyond what has been already suggested in the course of the preceding narrative. With the exception of his temporary loss of fortitude towards the close of his life, the most unseemly blot in his biography is, perhaps, his share in the process for absolving the King from his nuptial contract with Anne of Cleves. It would undoubtedly have brightened his reputation, if he had stood alone in opposition to that very disreputable transaction. The only palliation that can be offered for his conduct is, that resistance to the wishes of the King never seems to have entered the head of any in-

[1] This conference between the Archbishop and his Secretary is reported by Foxe; and is printed in note (o) to vol. i. p. 319, of Cranmer's Remains. It has been briefly referred to in the first volume of the present work, p. 270, 271.

dividual, either in Parliament or Convocation; and that the Archbishop never appears to have been conscious that there was any thing disgraceful or iniquitous in the proceeding. There is extant in his correspondence a letter of his to Wriothesly, in which he expresses great disturbance of spirit at a Latin Epistle which he had received from Dantiscus, a Polish Bishop; among other things, reflecting severely on the capricious marriages and shameful divorces of the King. This letter is dated the first of September, 1540. Henry's separation from Anne of Cleves had taken place in the July preceding; and, consequently, that process must have been among the objects of the zealous Bishop's reprobation. The displeasure of Cranmer at these imputations is extreme. "Since I have received this letter," he says, "I have been much inquieted therewith; considering what heinous rumours, by mischievous tongues, be spread into so far countries, of the King's Majesty, which would make any true and loving subject's heart bleed in his body, to hear or read of his Prince." He then professes his anxiety to answer Dantiscus, but declares his unwillingness to do so without the previous sanction of the King [1]. Whether any such answer was framed is not known. But if the tone of this letter be combined with the confidence expressed by Cranmer to Henry, the January follow-

[1] See Cranmer's Remains, vol. i. pp. 299—303, and the Letter of Dantiscus, p. 300, note (n).

ing [1], in the justice of his last divorce, it will be sufficient to show that he did not consider that transaction as at all open to reproach or blame.

It may be difficult to account for so strange an eclipse of moral feeling, and common sense. And yet it ought to be borne in mind, that the consciences of other great Reformers were not exempt from occultations, at least equally portentous. It is notorious that Luther himself, at one time, did not scruple to talk of allowing Henry VIII. to have two wives; that the sons of the German nobility were permitted, by the Protestant Divines, to keep their concubines; and that Melancthon and Martin Bucer themselves were present at the private marriage of Philip Landgrave of Hesse, to Margaret de Sala, on the 3d March, 1540, the Landgravine being yet alive! These things form the subject of loud reproach and complaint in a letter addressed by Cranmer to Osiander, in the course of the same year. And it is remarkable that, in that same letter, the Archbishop observes, that the persons who endured and countenanced such practices, were presuming to pronounce the most contemptuous censure on certain statutes of the English Parliament, while they were utterly ignorant of the grave and solid reasons for those enactments [2]. These matters, it is true, cannot be produced in vindication

[1] Ante, vol. i. p. 217, 218. Also Remains, vol. i. p. 311, 312.

[2] See Cranmer's Remains, vol. i. p. 300—307.

of either party. To show that Bucer and Melancthon were wrong, can never prove that the English Divines were right. But yet, circumstances like these are apt to engender some perplexing speculations on the caprices of human judgment. It is strange that the German Reformers should have escaped the most indignant censure of Protestants, while Cranmer has occasionally been stigmatized by them as a prodigy of cowardice and turpitude!

Of the infirmity which clouded a few of the latter days of the Archbishop, it is impossible to speak without the deepest sorrow. But, most certainly, they are little to be envied who can speak of it with scorn. The fall of human courage and integrity is always a melancholy spectacle; and the ruin is more awful in proportion to the stateliness of the pile. They who can look contemptuously on the frailty of Cranmer, would surely do well to correct the acrimony of their feelings by the reflection, that the man who fulfilled the prediction of his Saviour by thrice denying him, lived also to verify his words,—*on this Rock will I build my Church.* And if it should be urged, that the holiest Pastor of that Church is not worthy to be named together with the Apostle, we then, at least, may ask why the weakness of Cranmer is to be visited with merciless reproach, while the similar infirmities of other illustrious men are scarcely had in remembrance? There are few greater names in our Ecclesiastical History than that of Bishop Jewel. And yet we seldom find his name accompanied by ungracious recollections of unfaithfulness. The mention

of it reminds us only of the mighty and triumphant champion of the Church of England. And yet, if Malice had been as trumpet-tongued in impeaching his fame, as she has been in proclaiming the infamy of Cranmer, she would have been at no loss for a theme of obloquy. She might have numbered Jewel,—as Cranmer has frequently been numbered,—among the dishonoured company of fearful and double-minded men. For it is well known, that, in the hour of persecution, Jewel fell from his stedfastness. He set his hand to the words of falsehood, and then fled for safety to the continent! But he afterwards, in the presence of a Protestant congregation, confessed his "abject and cowardly mind and faint heart," and, with sighs and tears, publicly asked pardon of God and man; and so, his fault was remembered no more [1]. Now Cranmer would *not* fly in the day of peril. And though his flesh and heart did afterwards fail him for a time, he, like Jewel, publicly acknowledged and deplored his frailty with sighs and tears: and this, too, he did, not before a peaceable assembly of his brethren, but in the sight and hearing of furious enemies,—yea, in the very midst of the fire itself. And yet there are some who appear resolved to record his *apostasy* in marble, and to commemorate in the sand his inestimable services as the master builder of our

[1] This penitent confession was made by Jewel at Frankfort; "the whole auditory accompanying him with tears and sighs, and ever esteeming him more for his ingenuous repentance, than they would, perhaps, if he had not fallen." Eccl. Biogr. vol. iv. p. 31.

National Church! It is exceedingly difficult to account for this spirit of unequal judgment. But it may well prompt us to exclaim,—*Let me fall into the hands of God, for his mercies are great: and let me not fall into the hands of man.* To the mercy and the righteousness of God we may accordingly commit the cause of his servant: humbly and reverently trusting that his labours will find, before the judgment seat of his Redeemer, a more gracious acceptance than has, sometimes, awaited them on earth!

Of Cranmer's private and individual history, the materials are by no means very copious. This might reasonably have been expected. His life, during the earlier period of it, was that of a retired scholar. The remainder of it was passed in public cares and toils. But, whatever has been collected respecting his personal habits and dispositions, is in full harmony with the exhibition of his character presented to us in the history of the times. For many particulars respecting him, we are partly indebted to a manuscript[1] account, drawn up by his secretary Morice. From these details we find that Cranmer's demeanour was at all times so distinguished for moderation and equanimity, that no one would have imagined that he ever had an enemy. Enemies, however, as we have seen, he undoubtedly had, and these both open and concealed. The secret hostility

[1] Parts of it have been transcribed by Foxe, Eccl. Biog. vol. iii. and by Strype, Cranmer, b. iii. c. 30. and other places. It was communicated by Morice to Archbishop Parker, and is now among the Parker MSS. in C. C. C. Cambridge.

was rendered comparatively harmless to his quiet, by his calm and unsuspicious temper. The assaults of undisguised malice were generally defeated, in part by his exemplary patience, and in part by his natural clemency and kindliness of heart. He had, in an eminent degree, the secret of possessing his soul in peace; and this, in the midst of slander and injury, which might well have discomposed the meekness of a primitive saint. Such, indeed, was the placability of his temper, that it has exposed him to the suspicion of having been left by nature wholly without the instinct of anger or revenge; a tame, mean-spirited creature, who "did lack gall to make oppression bitter;" a sort of monster of moral neutrality and feebleness, equally incapable of gratitude or resentment, and solicitous for nothing but self-preservation. It may, indeed, be questioned, whether his sense of injury was always keen enough to extort from him any adequate manifestations of contempt and aversion, in cases where merely his own character and safety had been atrociously assailed. The villainy of the Kentish conspirators, for instance, might, without any breach of Christian mildness, have been visited by something more than a gentle rebuke[1]. Again,—the well-known saying of Bishop Hethe, "that the surest way to secure the good offices of the Archbishop, was to do him some notable displeasure[2]," may be regarded as arguing an almost

[1] Eccl. Biog. vol. iii. p. 490.
[2] Strype, Cranmer, b. iii. c. 30.

incredible superiority over human passion. If, however, in this respect, Cranmer's interpretation of the Christian maxims was unusually rigorous, the world may surely *forgive him this wrong!* The example is not likely to become very pernicious. At all events, the danger of such an example can never justify us in endeavouring to reason down his most exalted virtues into contemptible defects.

But, however abundant the milk of human kindness might be in Cranmer's disposition, its quality was always more or less liable to change, under the influence of righteous displeasure against public delinquency. Injuries offered merely to himself, moved him but little. But offences against great public interests could always stir his spirit. There is a letter written by him to Thirlby, Archdeacon of Ely, dated May, 1534, (upon some occasion not now distinctly known,) which shows that the Primate could assume the tone of becoming severity and sternness, whenever it was dictated by a sense of duty. The following is not the language of a man lost in apathy:

"Master Archdeacon,—I commend me to you; signifying to you, that I have received your letters, together with a billet from the King's Highness in them enclosed; whereby, among other things, I perceive your ambitious mind, in seeking your own glory, and advancement of your name; and that unjustly, without your deserts, in that you desire me to confess, by writing, your diligence; laying to my charge, that heretofore I have been a testimony of your neg-

ligence. If you have hitherto been accounted negligent, there is nothing, as meseemeth, as yet commenced and done on your behalf, whereby you do not declare yourself in deed, the same man that I spake in word. Although ye have changed the kind of negligence, from a slow negligence to a rash negligence. For so negligently have you run of heed in this matter, that you have advertised me never a word of those things, which I desire to know the King's pleasure in[1]."

The reader will easily call to mind another still more striking instance of the commotion which the sight of baseness could raise in his feelings,—namely, the vehement language of his Declaration against the Mass, in the commencement of the reign of Mary[2]. In this case, an atrocious calumny had been directed personally against himself; but then the slander was of such a nature, that it involved most serious injury and danger to the cause of the Reformation. To be tame, therefore, on such an occasion, would be to act the traitor to a cause which he held sacred. And the language of this document is, accordingly, more warm and impassioned than any thing, perhaps, which ever fell from his pen. And it is beyond all doubt, that this "seditious paper," as it was termed by the Council, had precisely the effect which he could wish; for, while it exasperated his enemies, it ani-

[1] Cranmer's Remains, vol. i. p. 113, 114. Lett. 120.

[2] Ante, c. xv.

mated the Reformers with resolution to be faithful unto death[1].

The same spirit which withheld him from the indulgence of all personally vindictive emotion, would, of course, enable him to rule his household peaceably, without unseemly asperity of manner, or of speech. Never was a word of abuse heard to issue from the lips of the Archbishop to the meanest of his attendants; much less was the language of offence or insult ever addressed by him to a stranger. At the present day, this may possibly appear a topic of commendation too insignificant to be adverted to. But the age in which he lived was coarse and unrefined. The houses of the great were then, not unfrequently, disgraced by the almost brutal demeanour of masters towards their menials and dependents: and it is to be feared that Ecclesiastics were by no means wholly exempt from this degrading imputation[2]. An ex-

[1] "Confirmabant adeò illæ schedæ Cantuarensis animos piorum, ut jam non dubitarent pro veritate mori: et adversarios adeo exacerbarunt, ut è vestigio novum crimen proditionis in Cantuarensem intenderint, atque ad judicium citarint." Epist. Reform. Helvet. Fueslin. lxxvi. §. 9. cited in the Ed. Pref. to Cranmer's Remains, p. cxi. note (*y*).

[2] "It is reported of all who knew him (Cranmer), that he never raged so far with any of his household servants, as once to call the meanest of them varlet, or knave, in anger; much less to reprove a stranger in reproachful words. Much unlike, in this part, to the property (as it seemeth) of some other inferior Bishops of this realm, which have not spared to fly in the faces, to pluck off the beards, to burn the hands, to beat and scourge with rods the bodies both of gentlemen, married men, and others,

ample of humanity and consideratenecss towards domestics was, therefore, among the most important benefactions which could be conferred on society by the first dignitary of the church.

Of the charity and munificence of Cranmer it is almost needless to speak. We have already seen, that a question relative to this part of his conduct was never raised by his enemies, without covering them with confusion. His household was always maintained with becoming stateliness and plenty: and even they who wished for an enlargement in the scale of his hospitality, were compelled to confess that his generosity to the pious, the learned, and the necessitous, had utterly disabled him for a more splendid style of entertainment, even if such had been desirable [1]. His palace was, in fact, the asylum of persecuted virtue, and friendless scholarship: and so noble was his liberality, that it was limited solely by the extent of his resources [2]. His benevolence towards the poor was of the same primitive character. Of this an eminent example has been preserved, in his

having almost nothing else in their mouth but fools, and knaves," &c. &c. Foxe in Eccl. Biog, vol. iii. p. 438.

[1] See ante, c. xii. ad fin.

[2] Among the foreigners entertained by him, may be named, Peter Martyr, Martin Bucer, Paulus Fagius, Emanuel Tremellius, Bernardin Ochinus, Peter Alexander, Valerandus Pollanus. All these, together with their families, were entertained by Cranmer. "In hos, aliosque doctos theologos tantâ beneficentiâ usus est Cranmerus, ut, collectis quotannis suarum expensarum rationibus, nihil sibi ex reditibus residui superesse poterat." Matt. Parker, Antiq. Britt. Eccl. p. 508.

care for the sick and wounded soldiers on their return from the French wars at Boulogne. His residence at Bekesbourne, in Kent, was almost converted into an hospital for their reception. His almoner was charged to see them provided with all the comforts requisite for their condition; and a surgeon and physician were retained by him in his house, on purpose to attend upon them: and when they were recovered sufficiently to depart, they were furnished with money for their expenses, in proportion to the distance they had to travel[1]. The effect of all this openness of heart and hand was, that he was repeatedly suffering from the embarrassment of straitened circumstances[2]. And the same would probably have been the case, had his revenues been of threefold their actual amount. His beneficence would, doubtless, have always kept pace with the enlargement of his fortunes. And such appears to have been the impression of that portion of his adversaries, who, while others complained of his covetousness and parsimony, were clamouring against his wastefulness and profusion!

The correspondence of the Archbishop (a large portion of which has recently been printed for the first time), furnishes additional illustration of his benevolent and friendly temper. The most cursory inspection of it will be sufficient to show, that his good offices were always in readiness on behalf of those among his acquaintance and his dependents, whom he

[1] Eccl. Biog. vol. iii. p. 464, 465.

[2] This appears from his correspondence, Remains, vol. i.

considered as worthy of recommendation or advancement. The same correspondence likewise contributes towards the establishment of another point, which has already been adverted to; namely, that though the principle of persecution was a plague, which lingered for a time even in the constitution of the Reformed Church, the gentleness of the Archbishop's temperament was constantly tending to a mitigation of its virulence. There appears to have been a constant effort within him, to throw off the infection. Of this there is evidence, in a letter of his to Cromwell, dated April 30, 1535, respecting the Carthusian Monks, who afterwards were executed for offences against the Act for suppressing the authority of the Bishop of Rome[1]. In speaking of these persons, he says—"It much pitieth me that such men should suffer, with so ignorant judgments: and if there be none other offence laid against them but this one, it will be much more for the conversion of all the fauters hereof, after mine opinion, that their consciences may be clearly averted from the same, by communication of sincere doctrine, and so they to publish it likewise to the world, than by the justice of the Law to suffer in such ignorance. And if it would please the King's Highness to send them unto me, I suppose I could do very much in their behalf[2]." Such moderate counsels, however, found but little acceptance with Cromwell. He persevered in the proceedings against the prisoners,—overawed the reluctant jury by vio-

[1] 28 Henry VIII. c. 10.

[2] Remains, vol i. p. 134, 135. Letter 145.

lence and menace,—and brought those unhappy men to their fate, within four days after the date of the Primate's intercession [1]. The conduct of the Secretary was equally brutal towards four other members of the same House, who were dragged, by his orders, out of the Church, at High Mass, to the Cathedral, and there compelled to listen to a Sermon on the King's Supremacy [2]. The contrast is, in this instance, most remarkable, between the mildness of the Archbishop, and the spirit of the times, as manifested in the agent of the King.

The domestic and private life of Cranmer appears to have been, in all respects, precisely such as becomes a Christian Prelate. His regular and laborious habits of study were never laid aside. His usual hour of rising was five. The next four hours were generally given to reading or devotion. The interval between nine o'clock and the hour of dinner (probably twelve at the latest), was dedicated to public business, to the reception of applicants, and to the dispatch of matters connected with his Ecclesiastical office. After dinner, if petitioner or suitor still remained to be heard, his time was at their disposal: and the most unsuccessful seldom departed without cause for extolling the patience and lenity of their judge. If no such matters remained, an hour, or more, was employed by him either in chess, or in looking over the players at that game. He then returned to his study till five; and it was his custom

[1] Strype's Eccl. Mem. vol. i. c. 28. [2] Ibid.

there, to prosecute his literary labours, not sitting in his chair, but standing at his desk; a practice answering some of the purposes of exercise, and certainly most conducive to bodily health. From five o'clock to supper, the interval was occupied, partly in hearing the Common Prayer, and partly in walking, or other recreation. At the supper table he was often merely a spectator; for his appetite did not always make that meal needful to him: and, on such occasions, he would sit with his gloves on, and converse with the guests whom his hospitality had assembled. An hour of gentle exercise or cheerful pastime followed; and at nine he went back to his study, and there he remained till he retired to rest.

Such was, for the most part, the even tenor of Cranmer's days. The above orderly distribution of his time enabled him to make such incessant and large accumulations of knowledge, that the charge of ignorance circulated against him by the Papists, must have been the stupidest of all calumnies. So ample were his resources, and so complete his command over them, that, if the King was desirous of an expeditious answer to some difficult question in Theology or Canon Law, he had only to send word to the Archbishop over night: the next morning was sure to bring back a collection of references or extracts, abundantly sufficient to guide the Royal judgment. The authority of thirty, forty, sixty different writers, would be brought together on the spur of the occasion; so that "these notes would advertise the King more in one day, than all the learned men could do

in a month." It may, possibly, be said that this is the exaggerated statement of a partial domestic. It is, nevertheless, confirmed by a saying of the King himself. His Majesty and Gardiner were once engaged in a discussion with the Archbishop on the authority of the Canons of the Apostles. The King and the Bishop of Winchester contended, that these Constitutions were as valid and conclusive as the writings of the Evangelists. This position, however, was combated with so much power and cogency by the Archbishop, that Henry was constrained to exclaim—"My Lord of Canterbury is too old a truant for us twain [1]." The learning must have been great indeed, which could extort a testimony like this, from the Royal antagonist of Luther.

The following representation of the Archbishop's general character, may possibly be received by some with caution, and even with suspicion; for it comes from Osiander of Nuremberg, the uncle of his second wife. It should be recollected, however, that the portrait represents him merely as a distinguished individual resident in Germany, and previously to his advancement to the Primacy of England. He is described by Osiander as "a gentleman of good birth and quality; as having an aspect and presence that carried dignity with it, and an incredible sweetness of manners; as endowed with learning beyond the common degrees of it; as benign and liberal towards all; and especially to those that were studious, and

[1] Strype, Cranmer, b. iii. c. 30.

of good literature. In addition to these more common qualities, he was endowed with those more abstruse heroical virtues rarely to be found in the age in which he lived; namely, his wisdom, prudence, fortitude, temperance, justice; a singular love towards his country, the highest faithfulness towards the King; a contempt of earthly things, a love of heavenly; a most burning study towards the Evangelic truth, sincere religion, and Christ's glory [1]."

Again—Peter Martyr was among the foreigners who were bountifully entertained and patronized by Cranmer: and this may, possibly, be held to disqualify him as a witness in behalf of his friend. But, whatever may be thought of it, his testimony is as follows:—" His godliness, prudence, faithfulness, and singular virtues, were well known throughout the kingdom. He was so adorned with the grace and favour of Christ, as that, though all others were the children of wrath, yet, in him, piety, divine knowledge, and other virtues, might seem to be naturally born and bred; such deep root had they taken in him. So that I often wished, and professed that I should esteem it as a great benefit vouchsafed to me of God, that I might approach as nearly as possible to his excellencies. As to myself, and others, fled into these quarters for religion, Cranmer's kindness and humanity towards us were such that, if I should render just thanks, I must do nothing but tell of them: and how much soever I might extol them, the greatness of the matter would

[1] Strype, Cranmer, b. iii. c. 37.

overreach my speech[1]." All this may, possibly, be reckoned by the cautious reader, among those instances of injudicious commendation which may have helped to arm the suspicions and the prejudices of many against the memory of the Archbishop. And yet it is most certain, that, of Cranmer's hospitality at least, Martyr has not recorded one syllable beyond the truth. Of the other virtues of his friend and patron, the Florentine has spoken, as grateful and honourable men are apt to speak of their benefactors. The facts before the reader will enable him to supply whatever corrections truth and justice may appear to require.

With regard to the intellectual powers of Cranmer, solidity seems to have been their leading attribute. His faculties were eminently practical. The imaginative power scarcely entered into the composition of his mind. He was incessantly employed in patient accumulation of authorities and precedents. He could never rest until he had explored all that had been said or thought before him, relative to any peculiar subject of his research. The qualities of his understanding were those, which were fitted rather to make a sound and cautious Judge, than a commanding Advocate. The progress of his mind through any region of inquiry, was generally slow and painful. He proceeded like a person who was laying down a chart. The work was tedious and protracted; but when once it was completed, its guidance might be thoroughly relied on. Capacities like these were not

[1] Strype's Cranmer, b. iii. c. 37.

of that high order which confers immortality on inventors and discoverers. But they were exactly fitted for the office which Providence assigned him. A more impetuous temperament, or even a more quick and intuitive perception of truth, might have betrayed him into impatience and precipitation. They might thus have raised up against the Reformation a barrier of prejudice and opposition, even at the very outset; or else might have hurried on its chariot wheels, till they took fire with their own speed, and carried ruin and confusion with them, in their career. The habit of unwearied investigation—the dispassionate examination of moral evidence—the insensibility to mere popular impulse—the steady and single-hearted love of truth—these are the qualities requisite for a religious Reformer; and these qualities were eminently concentrated in Cranmer. To the desire of popular applause, for its own sake, he seems to have been an utter stranger. We can discern, in his life, nothing like a fretful jealousy of his mere literary reputation. It is quite evident that, when he wrote, he wrote, not for fame, but for the accomplishment of an immediate purpose. When an error was to be put down, or a truth to be established, he turned to his books, and his collections; and his object was, not to compile an immortal volume, but to produce a deep and lasting effect on the public mind. His fame is recorded, not so much in his written works, as in the enduring institutions of his country. The monument of his wisdom is around us.

On the movements which were directed by his pre-

siding judgment, it is impossible to reflect, without an overpowering conflict of feelings. The period of the great moral revolution is undoubtedly a period to rejoice over: but, then, we must always rejoice over it with trembling. It is a period which cannot be contemplated without the deepest thankfulness; but then our gratitude and elation of heart are often dashed with a sense of humiliation. What can be more glorious than the deliverance accomplished? What can be more sordid than a portion of the instrumentality by which that deliverance was wrought? Is it not awful to think, that the caprice of a despotic Sovereign should have helped to give the first impulse to so wondrous and holy a movement?—that the banner of religious Reformation should have been lifted by hands stained with blood, and polluted with rapine?—that if Henry's passions had been less impetuous, or his strength of purpose less inflexible, we might, perhaps, have been, at this moment, even as other lands, which have never won their Church's independence,—which are *made spoil of* either *by philosophy*, or *by vain deceit*,—by secret scepticism, or by gaudy and painted superstition? It is difficult to meditate on these things, without being well nigh shaken to pieces with the reflection. It is triumphant to think on the eminence on which we stand. It is appalling to look back upon the terrors, the struggles, and the humiliations, through which that eminence was attained. Never, perhaps, was the truth more signally exemplified,—that God can cause the wrath of man to praise him: and not only the wrath of

man, but his follies and his crimes. A hurricane may sometimes sweep away the pestilence from a tropical atmosphere. A resistless despotism may, almost as unconsciously, sweep away the moral corruption which has been gathering for centuries.

Assuredly, there is neither wisdom nor honesty in averting our eyes from this view of the matter. It cannot be contended that the cause of the Reformation imposes on us the necessity of vindicating, or even of palliating, the vices that often intruded themselves into the work. The Pontifical writers, it is well known, are perpetually reproaching us with the vile agency by which the change was brought about. They affect to speak of the Reformation as a portentous mixture of error and of crime,—in which, Henry was the principal, and the Court, the Parliament, and the People, were the accessaries. According to them, it came into the world with a taint of original sin about it: and they call upon us to return from an apostasy, rendered doubly detestable by the wickedness of its leader. Now, it is vain, and worse than vain, to attempt to blunt the edge of these rebukes, by softening the defects of the Royal *heretic*, or the hypocrisy and baseness of many of his creatures. Why should the rack of controversy be produced to extort from us the confession, that, if Henry had retained, to the last, a cordial attachment to his brother's widow, we might, *possibly*, at this hour, be stupifying or maddening ourselves, as of old, with the cup of Babylonian sorcery; that the peasantry of England might now have been almost as degraded and priest-

ridden a herd as the peasantry of Ireland,—and that the allegiance of her people might still have been divided between a rightful Monarch, and an Italian Bishop! That these things are not so, is a blessed result, which we are bound to receive with gratitude at the hand of a mysterious Providence. But why should we seek to disguise the fact, that this result emerged out of a fearful conflict of human passions,—a strife of elements, from which good could have been elicited only by the Power which rules the tempests? Surely it is better to say, at once, *this is the Lord's doing, and it is marvellous in our eyes*, than to be weaving apologies for men, who were, many of them, blindly working out the purposes of the Almighty, often without a thought for his glory, or a care for the virtue or the happiness of his people.

That our Reformation, indeed, was *conceived in sin*, it would be most unjust and most ungrateful to maintain: for, undoubtedly, the seeds of it were scattered, by the hands of sincere and holy men, long before the days of Henry VIII. But when we look to certain of its mightiest patrons and leaders, in his time, we feel almost compelled to avow that it was cradled in iniquity, and "nursed in baseness." When we view it, purely with reference to the secular agency by which it was established, we are tempted to liken it to a lamb suckled by a wolf; or, to a dove warmed into life by the incubation of a vulture: and, in truth, it seemed, at times, as if the foster parent was ready to devour its adopted progeny. And when we come to inquire how it is that the new

establishment survived the tender mercies of its protectors,—how it was preserved in the midst of patronage which seemed every moment to threaten it with destruction,—we find ample reason for adoring the Wisdom and Goodness which often causes the most formidable evils to correct each other, and to give to the results some intermediate and beneficial direction.

It has been affirmed, and truly enough, that politicians and not divines had, in some respects, the most potential voice in the formation of our Protestant Church. The impulse which led to her establishment came, unquestionably, from the high places of the land. The Sovereign was constantly at the head of all the changes ; and hence it was that the passions and interests of a Court were seen to busy themselves in the settlement of the national faith and worship. And all this has given occasion to our enemies to load the Reformation with unmeasured obloquy, and to represent it merely as the work of unholy and desperate state-craft. But now let us consider the matter under another point of view. Let us ask ourselves what might have been the fate of the Church of England, if the imperious spirit of Henry had never roused itself against the domination of the Papacy? In that case, either the pure doctrines of the Gospel might have long continued to be like *hidden manna*,—like bread eaten in secret, with trembling and with carefulness; or else, the furies of intestine discord might have rushed in to aggravate the confusion of religious strife, to make the land a *desolation and an astonish-*

ment. Enough of persecution and outrage undoubtedly there was, in England, to fill the hearts of humane and thoughtful men with sorrow and with dismay. But let the atrocities attendant on our religious conflicts be placed against those which dogged the course of Protestantism in France,—and they will appear as the chastisement with whips, compared to the chastisement with scorpions. Let the reader begin with the heretics of Meaux, in 1524, and follow the blood hounds of bigotry throughout their sanguinary chase, from that period till the massacre of St. Bartholomew, in 1572; and then let him sum up all the cruelties committed on the English Gospellers, from the accession of Henry VIII. to the end of the reign of Mary. The computation, if we mistake not, will leave us abundant reason most gratefully to acknowledge that ours were but light afflictions, to the agony of that fiery trial which was ordained for our neighbours. And to what, under Providence, is the success of our Reformers, and the *comparatively* limited measure of our sufferings, to be principally ascribed, but to the fact, that Henry led the way in the assault against the battlements of the Papacy; and that the Princely boy who succeeded him encouraged an unsparing search into the most secret hiding places of the Romish superstition? In France, on the contrary, the New Doctrine, as it was called, began by establishing itself in the less distinguished provinces of society, and wrought its way upwards to the more conspicuous regions: and there, unhappily, it found the arm of flesh indignantly and fiercely arrayed

against it. And the consequence was, that the kingdom was deluged with blood, and torn to pieces by the frenzy of contending factions; and that the Papacy was, in the end, enabled to maintain its dominion over the land. In contrasting these two cases, we may very safely concede that the passions of Henry, and the flagitious cupidity of his favourites and courtiers, are worthy of all reprobation: and we may heartily wish that many of the agents, who laid their hand upon the work, had been more worthy of so magnificent a cause. But after all, the only question of importance is, whether, or not, the Reformation has been a blessing to us? And if we are persuaded that it has, what remains for us but to be thankful to Him, who compelled even the lusts and caprices of bad men to labour, almost unconsciously, for the achievement of our deliverance?

Again,—it can scarcely be denied that, in another important respect, the peculiar circumstances under which that deliverance was wrought, were graciously overruled for good. In the midst of manifold evils, they were attended with this redeeming consequence: namely, that the perpetual inspection and interference of secular men was partly instrumental in repressing the fanaticism which might otherwise have thrown too much heat into the work, and burst it into fragments, before it was complete. The moderation which resulted from this state of things, and which is impressed so remarkably on the whole face of the system, is an advantage which never can be too highly estimated. It is perhaps to this that the stability of our Eccle-

siastical fabric is, humanly speaking, to be mainly ascribed: for enthusiasm generally contains within itself the seeds of change and of decay. Now, even the selfishness, the ambition, the avarice, which stood by, while the process of reformation was going on, may have contributed at least to prevent the lavish introduction of this perilous ingredient. They may, it is true, have given something of a mean and worldly aspect to the whole course of proceeding. But they helped to preserve the Church from being deeply tainted with an infusion, which would have rendered it distasteful to the intelligent, and dangerous to the moral and spiritual health of the community.

Among the most painful accompaniments of the Reformation was the system of pillage, introduced by Henry, and followed with disastrous fidelity by those who co-operated with him, and by those also who came after. This subject has frequently forced itself upon our notice in the body of the present work. We have seen transferred to an unprincipled Aristocracy, the funds which ought to have been sacred to the intellectual, moral, and religious improvement of the people. The impoverishment of the parochial Clergy, by the impropriation of tithes, was one dreadful item in the price, which this nation had to pay for her Protestant establishment. It ought, however, in justice to be remembered, that for this iniquitous confiscation, we stand originally indebted to the monastic system. The great tithes, it is well known, formed a considerable portion of the revenues of the religious houses. And the general practice of these communities

was, to reserve for their own use the emoluments derived from this source, and to provide for the spiritual service of the parishes, by which the tithes were paid, often by a trifling payment in money to a resident vicar; a payment which, of course, became perpetually more trifling, as money became more depreciated. When the religious houses were suppressed, their impropriate tithes would have formed a source of endowment sufficient to secure a proper maintenance to every parochial minister in the kingdom. A noble opportunity was thus offered of rescuing the country from the evils of an indigent or non-resident Clergy. But this opportunity was most shamefully neglected. The impropriate tithes followed the fate of all other monastic property, and were transferred into the hands of laymen, who were bound to render no earthly service to the public, in return for their share of the spoil. And the effect of this, together with other measures of plunder, has been to reduce the Church of England to a state of comparative beggary and humiliation. It has been allowed on all hands, that this odious rapacity has left an indelible stain upon the Reformation: but then, it has sometimes been contended, that it was a stain only because it transgressed all moderate bounds. With regard, more especially, to the confiscation of lands belonging to the Bishoprics and the Cathedrals, it has been suggested, that no one could desire to see the whole body of English dignitaries in possession of that enormous extent of landed property, which was in their hands three centuries ago. And, un-

doubtedly, if the Government had first multiplied the Bishops' sees, and had secured a respectable and liberal provision to all the Bishops, and had assigned the impropriate tithes, or a righteous equivalent for them, to the parochial clergy,—and had they further, conformably to the views of Cranmer, applied the remainder, or an ample portion of the remainder, not merely to the support of dignitaries, but to various purposes connected with humanity, or sound learning, or religious worship and education,—if they had done this, they would have been fairly entitled to credit for virtuous and Christian motives. It might then have been reasonably presumed, that they were animated solely by a sincere regard to the most precious interests of mankind. This, however, they did not do, nor any thing like this. And,—whether it was that they were unable, or unwilling, to do it,—in either case it is undeniable, that a base and worldly spirit mixed itself with the achievement, to disfigure its glories, and to maim its usefulness. And it may surely be contended, that, in controversy with our enemies, it is better to admit this, candidly and intrepidly, than to be making awkward efforts to soften or to conceal this disreputable portion of the history.

Every one, indeed, is aware, that, in the judgment of Roman Catholics, the whole transfer of the revenues of the Anglo-Romish Church was, from the beginning to the end of it, neither more nor less than a process of spoliation; and this, whether Protestant laymen, or Protestant ecclesiastics, were the receivers of the plundered property. The discussion of this

subject, in all its compass, would be much too extensive for the limits of a work like this. We must, therefore, confine ourselves to one view of the matter, which, if it fails to present a complete survey of the question, may at least supply a partial illustration of it. Let us then imagine, that a believer in judicial astrology had, in former times, founded a professorship, or an institution, for the promotion of his favourite science. After a lapse of time, judicial astrology falls into discredit, and is at last utterly exploded. What, then, is to be done with the endowment? Is the property to revert to the heir at law, if an heir can be found,—or is it to escheat to the Crown? or, may it not righteously be applied to the promotion of the science of astronomy; astronomy being a pursuit the most congenial that can be imagined to that which was in the original contemplation of the founder? Again,—Suppose, that many centuries previously to the time of Copernicus, a similar establishment had been endowed, for the cultivation of astronomical science generally. The system of astronomy taught there from the beginning would necessarily be that of Ptolemy. Would it, then, be any iniquitous violation of the founder's will, in after times, to vary the instruction given, conformably to the successive improvements of the science, and to eject from the institution all those who should persist in the ancient course of ignorance and error? To come somewhat nearer to the matter,—let us imagine that all the endowments of our national religion had been originally made in the days of Druidism. Can

it be reasonably contended, that it would have been an act of spoliation to transfer those consecrated revenues to the Church, when Druidism fell before the religion of the Cross? The train of thought suggested by these imaginary cases may, perhaps, conduct the reader to a proper estimate of the proceeding, by which a portion of the wealth of the Papal Church in England was made over to the Reformed Establishment. Beyond this point, however, the analogy altogether fails. To substitute true science for ancient error,—true religion for false,—pure doctrine for superstitious corruption,—is, not wholly to set at nought the views in which the donations originated, but rather to fulfil them in the best manner which varying circumstances would allow. But to seize upon funds devoted to the advancement of knowledge, morality, and religion, and to convey them to the hands of individual consumers, unfettered by a single condition for the benefit of society, is undoubtedly a process of most tyrannical and pernicious spoliation. The ostensible and avowed destination of Ecclesiastical property was, indisputably, to promote the moral and spiritual welfare of man. And even the most flagitious abuse of that property could confer on the legislature no other right, than that of employing the same funds for the accomplishment of similar purposes, though in a manner more unexceptionable, and less liable to failure.

It may, however, be insisted, that the possessions of the Clergy, both regular and secular, were at that time so enormous, that their very dispersion must have been beneficial to the State. But even if this were

granted, it could do literally nothing to vindicate, upon grounds of equity, the distribution which actually took place. It might, possibly, be a very proper subject of grave deliberation, even with a Christian legislature, to what extent a retrenchment of corporate property was absolutely required by the secular welfare of the realm? But every one must surely see the caution and the solemnity with which a question such as this should be approached. At all events, it will never be contended, that justice could be done to such a question, by leaving it to the caprice of an autocrat, to determine what portion should be retained for pious uses, and what portion should be lavished, perhaps among the most profligate and useless of mankind. And if it should be urged, that to expect so much disinterested wisdom from any human legislature, is to indulge in Utopian fancies, this too may be granted, without injury to our argument. It may be an Utopian fancy to look for justice at the hand of despotism, whether wielded by one tyrant, or by many. But this is no reason for abstaining from the condemnation of iniquity, whoever may be its perpetrator. It would be mere vanity and vexation of spirit, to speculate, at this day, on the amount of property which might have beneficially been left in possession of the Church,—or on the various ways in which those revenues might have been made to contribute to our highest interests, with good hope of the Divine blessing. But though it is far too late to enter usefully into such speculations, it never can be too late to protest against an application of history which may be fatally pernicious in future. It cannot

be too late, at this day, to proclaim, that if the wisdom and the piety of Archbishop Cranmer had been listened to, the Church of England would, in all human probability, have been in a condition to minister much more powerfully, than she has yet been able to do, to all the highest interests of our country. The mischief done at that time, and the opportunities of good impiously thrown away, are enough to make the real friends of the Protestant cause redden with indignation. And they are *no* real friends to the cause, who can listen to the tale with apathy at the present day.

One word more respecting the course of the Reformation in England. We have been occasionally told that, in this country, the grand moral revolution called forth but little of that spirit, which has been its glory in other lands; that England has no such names to show as the names of Luther, and of Calvin, and of Knox. A moment's recollection of our history must show the injustice and the shallowness of this insinuation. Let the energies of Luther, or of Calvin, or of Knox, be what they might,—had their lot fallen in England, and had they attempted to take the lead in a religious revolution there, in opposition to the will, or without the full consent of Henry,—can any mortal doubt what must have been the fate of the Reformation? The heads of these men, or twenty such as these, would have been laid in the dust, long before they could have made any deep or enduring impression on the public mind. As the case actually happened, the proceedings of Henry gave

the Church an opportunity of gradually effecting her own Reformation. He lifted off from her the weight of Papal oppression; and then she was at liberty to run with patience the race that was set before her. The progress of the restoration, it is true, was attended with many awful vicissitudes: but, in the course of those vicissitudes, with what glorious displays of Christian energy and stedfastness are our annals illustrated! There is no country in Europe which has brighter instances to produce of "free-spoken truth," of singleness of purpose, and of faithfulness unto death. And what if these illustrious examples be found not always among those who call themselves *the excellent of the earth*, but in the ranks of comparatively humble and obscure suffering? What is there in all this which our Church need blush to avow? What does it prove, but that the intrinsic righteousness and holiness of the cause, (in spite of the abominations of its most powerful abettors), had found its way into the hearts of such men as Heaven loves to select, that it may confound the wisdom of the wise, and the powers of the mighty, and the terrors of the oppressor?—that persons were to be found, who held a steady course in the midst of the superstitious craft or giddy caprice of their own party, and in defiance of the threats of their enraged adversaries? With these men, and such as these, were deposited the very life and virtue of the enterprise. These were they, by whom, in reality, the warfare was accomplished; though Providence was pleased to use the earthly passions of Princes and of Nobles, as

pioneers to open the country for their operations. And then, if England had not, in the days of Henry, a Luther, or a Calvin, or a Knox among the first leaders of the new system, she has others to show, who, under the existing circumstances, were admirably fitted to promote among her people the interests of truth. Even in former days she had to boast a Wiclif, the intrepid spiritual progenitor of all her subsequent martyrs. But in the 16th century, she had men to produce incomparably better fitted than Wiclif for the peculiar emergency of the times; men who were gifted with all his zeal, and with much more than all his wisdom and discretion. To say nothing of Cranmer, she had her Ridley, and her Hoper, and a multitude of other names, which for profound learning, and for inflexible courage and self-devotion, are second to none among the most illustrious worthies of the Reformation; men who, in their rank and station, advanced the triumph of scriptural religion quite as effectually as Knox, or Luther, did in theirs. The cause may, originally, have been that of human interest and passion. By the example, the influence, and the sufferings, of such men as these, it was converted into the cause of holiness and virtue. These, therefore, rather than Henry and his courtiers, are to be deemed our essential and true Reformers. And by the purity of their lives, and the sincerity of their doctrines, and the fires of their Martyrdom, the evil and worldly savour which may, at first, have tainted the sacrifice, has doubtless been purged away.

These reflections, it will easily be understood, im-

ply nothing like disparagement of the services *instrumentally* rendered by Henry VIII. to the purification of our national Church. It has sometimes been said, that, if he was an implement in the hands of Providence, he was far from a trusty and effective implement; that he turned aside from the mark, *like a deceitful bow* in the hands of the archer. It may be suspected, however, that they who have spoken thus of him, have done so without placing before their eyes the whole of the benefits actually conferred by him on our National Establishment. It may be true that the Religion which he bequeathed to his people was of a strangely ambiguous description. It was Romanism stripped of much of its outward bravery, and bereft of many of its toys, and brought down to something like Protestant simplicity; but still it was, in doctrine, essentially Romanism. It must nevertheless be kept in mind, that, with all his zeal for the *Catholic* faith, Henry had, in fact, inflicted many a formidable blow on the Romish superstition. In the first place, consider that tremendous practicable breach in the ancient fortress, effected by the demolition of the Papal supremacy: and, secondly, the grievous reduction of the strength of Rome, accomplished by the dispersion of the "Papal militia," as the monastic orders had very justly been described. And, lastly, let us remember, that it was by the sanction of Henry, that the written word of God was placed in the hands of the Church, as the only lamp unto her feet, on her way to the recovery of the truth. The man who achieved for his country these three things,

may be said to have more than half completed the Reformation; for he threw down the chief obstructions to its commencement; and, moreover, he gave an impulse to it, which rendered it next to impossible that it should stop. We have seen that he himself, towards the close of his life, was impressed with the necessity of moving further onward. In the season of his wrath, he had unsealed the mystic vessel, and set free its long imprisoned tenant, the spirit of religious inquiry: and it demanded all his force of character to keep that restless power in awe. But to conjure it back again into its confinement, was a task which would probably have exceeded even his mastery over the "rough magic" of despotism. At all events, nothing was left for those who came after him, but to respect the energies which were still in manifest activity, and to carry forward the work to its consummation. One desperate attempt was made to roll back the tide of opinion; an attempt well adapted to the dogged temper of Mary, and to the remorseless and saturnine bigotry of Philip. But this sanguinary enterprise terminated, not only in defeat, but in a signal accession of strength to the Protestant cause. Henry VIII. had made Popery weak: his fanatical daughter made it intolerably odious. And the result has been, that the Church of England has been enabled to put away her corruptions, and to clothe herself in the primitive simplicity of the Gospel.

CHAPTER XVIII.

Cranmer's Writings.

It was observed by Strype, more than a century ago, that, "if somebody of leisure, and that had opportunity of libraries, would take the pains to collect together all the books and writings of this Archbishop (Cranmer), and publish them, it would be *a worthy work*, as both retrieving the memory of this extraordinary man, who deserved so well of the Church, and serving to illustrate the history of the Reformation[1]. That *worthy work* is now accomplished. A complete edition of the "Remains of Cranmer" has very recently issued from the Clarendon Press, to supply this desideratum to the Theological and Literary world. All the manuscripts which can safely be ascribed to Cranmer, together with the works of his which had been already printed, are now formed into a single collection. The value of this undertaking is sufficiently apparent from the facts, that Cranmer's "most elaborate production, the controversy with Gardiner on the Eucharist, had never been reprinted since 1580; and that the greater part of his minor

[1] Strype, Cranm. b. iii. c. 22.

compositions were only to be found by an irksome search in the pages of our Ecclesiastical historians[1]."

A considerable portion of these Remains consists of letters. Of these, some had long since been published in the works of Coverdale, Foxe, Burnet, and Strype. Others have been recently given to the world in the State Papers, or in Mr. Todd's Life of Cranmer. But still there was a large number remaining in manuscript. The whole of these are now brought together, and occupy the first volume of the "Remains." They form a collection of 301 letters, of which not more than 77 had ever been in print before. The correspondence commences in 1531, nearly two years previously to Cranmer's advancement to the Primacy; and it closes in 1566, only a short time before his martyrdom. It is most copious during the years which elapsed between his elevation, and the death of Cromwell, in 1540; and of what belongs to that interval, by far the greater part is addressed to that minister. Many of the letters relate to subjects of very trifling importance; others to the most interesting occurrences of the time. But the editor has very judiciously abstained from the rejection of any thing as too insignificant for publication. He justly observes, that "dates may be determined, local history illustrated, and slight shades of character distinguished, by what may appear, at first sight, altogether undeserving of attention ..... it has therefore been thought best to err on the side

[1] Editor's Preface, p. i. ii.

of tediousness, rather than suppression, and to withhold nothing."

The correspondence with Cromwell is, on one account, singularly curious and interesting; namely, for its multifarious and incessant reference to the judgment of the favourite. Nothing is either too little or too great to be submitted to his determination. From a scheme for remodelling the Church of Canterbury, down to an application on behalf of a "corpulent cellarer of the same society, the very jewel and housewife of that house,"—from questions relative to the Royal supremacy, or the translation of the Scriptures, down to a suggestion that the "King's Highness should send to the *County Palantyne* (Lewis the Pacific) a couple or two of great greyhounds, or as many of great mastiffs,"—nothing is too important or too insignificant to be brought under the consideration of Cromwell. It appears that the Archbishop could not even visit his own diocese without a licence from the Vicegerent[1]. Nothing, in short, can illustrate more fully than this miscellany, the vast power, and almost omnipresent influence of the great minister, and the perfect subjection of the Ecclesiastical authorities to the newly acknowledged supremacy of the Crown.

There are various letters in this collection, which show the readiness of the Archbishop to bestow his friendly offices, and to exert his influence, for the benefit of the distressed, and for the suppression of

[1] Remains, vol. i. p. 189. Lett. 184.

strife and evil will. There are several instances, in which he laboured to bring tithe-suits to a charitable end; and there is one remarkable occasion, on which he offers his paternal mediation between the parish of Hadleigh, and their curate, Thomas Ross, who had been hastily charged with uttering pernicious doctrine. The kind interference of the Archbishop was eminently seasonable, for at that time religious animosity was extremely violent at Hadleigh. It seems that Ross had formerly been arrested and brought before the Archbishop; but that Ross's friends were so strong, that it was said that a hundred men were not able to fetch him out of the town. On the present occasion, it appears that he was reinstated by the Archbishop, though with a promise that all just complaints against him should be duly attended to. The man was afterwards recommended by Cranmer for an Irish Archbishopric, in 1552[1].

The earliest of Cranmer's literary labours was his Book on the Divorce, composed by him at the desire of the King, in 1529[2]. The object of this work, it will be remembered, was to show, that marriage with a brother's widow is forbidden by the law of God; and consequently, that the Papal dispensation cannot give validity to such a union. It also maintained, that the Pope, being an interested party, could not be a fit judge of these propositions; and that the question could be determined only by reference to

[1] Cranmer's Remains, vol. i. 94. and 352, 353.

[2] See ante, vol. i. c. ii. p. 36, 37.

the collective learning of the Church, as represented by the Universities of Europe. It was, further, the opinion of Cranmer, that, when the decision of the Universities should be obtained, it would form a sufficient ground for a definitive sentence, to be pronounced by the Ecclesiastical judicature of England, without any further resort to Rome. This work was laid before the two English Universities, and the House of Commons; and it was presented by Cranmer himself to the Pope, accompanied by a declaration, that the author was prepared to defend it against all opposition. But notwithstanding the importance of this treatise, and the general attention excited by it at the time, we look for it in vain in the present collection of his "Remains." Not a fragment of it has been discovered. The substance of it, however, is probably contained in the Summary of the Reasons for the Divorce, published shortly afterwards by the King's printer, with the judgments of the Universities prefixed[1].

The sentence delivered in 1533, respecting the King's marriage, was speedily followed by an inquiry into that authority, by virtue of which the Pope commanded the King to replace Catherine in her conjugal rights, on pain of excommunication. It is well known, that the chief burden of this great question rested with Cranmer. There is, indeed, neither

[1] The contents of this Summary are described by Burnet, vol. i. p 97, &c.; and the heads of it printed by him in b. ii. Rec. No. 36. Ed. 1679.

speech nor publication of his now extant upon that specific subject: but the tenor of his arguments upon it may be collected from the various public instruments which he was concerned in preparing,—from passages in his later writings,—and lastly, from his "Collection of Tenets, extracted from the Canon Law, showing the extravagant pretensions of the Church of Rome." These Extracts were probably nothing more than a summary of much larger collections made by him during his residence at Cambridge; and they are accordingly printed, in the recent edition, as the earliest of his "Remains," instead of being placed (as Burnet has placed them) in 1544[1]. From the latter passages of them, it is manifest, that the Archbishop's objections to the Papal supremacy were not founded on principles of mere secular expediency. He is not content with showing, that the claims of the Pope were utterly inconsistent with the rights of all other sovereigns; but he concludes by producing the various Scriptures, from Deuteronomy to the Epistles of St. Peter, which had been hardily and profanely forced by the Bishops of Rome, into the service of their own usurpation. It is clear, therefore, that Cranmer considered the supremacy of the Pope as nothing more than a mere human institution; an institution, therefore, which might justly be abolished, when once it was proved to be destitute of all sanction from the word of God.

In considering this question, it must further be

[1] Cranmer's Remains, vol. i. p. 1, &c. and note (a).

remembered, that the Church of England had never been placed under subjection to the Western Patriarchate, by any act, either of a General Council, or of a National Synod. The good offices of Rome, therefore, in sending Augustine, at the end of the 6th century, to assist in the conversion of the Anglo-Saxons, can never be regarded as sufficient to fix upon this island the yoke of Ecclesiastical subjection. Her union with the Church of Rome is, in all justice, to be considered purely in the light of a voluntary alliance, not of a canonical incorporation. It was a union, which might, at any time, be dissolved, without the violation of any ordinance of the Catholic Church; and, consequently, without exposing the separating member to the charge of schism. As soon as the association was found to be injurious to either, it might be legally and innocently terminated by the complaining party. And this was precisely the argument used in the Protestation against the Council of Mantua[1]. "If you have authority, as long as our consent giveth it you, and you evermore will make your plea upon our consent, then let it have even an end where it began: we consent no longer,—your authority must needs be gone."

The sentiments of Cranmer respecting the authority of the Pope, and of General Councils, were also fully expressed by him in a long speech, of which Burnet declares that he had seen a copy, writ-

[1] Burnet, vol. i. b. iii. Rec. 5. Coll. vol. ii. p. 128. See ante, vol. i. c. v. p. 149, 150.

ten by a Secretary of the Archbishop, but of which he only gives the substance[1]. The Editor of his Remains has been compelled to content himself with re-printing Burnet's abstract of this oration, having searched in vain for a manuscript of the original[2].

It has been related above, that the Act of Six Articles was vigorously resisted by Cranmer, and that he was desired by the King to reduce his arguments to writing. This he accordingly did; and when the MS. was complete, he dispatched his Secretary Morice with it to Cromwell. In consequence of a ludicrous accident, related by Foxe, the papers were very nearly lost, in their passage across the Thames. But they at last found their way safely into the hands of the Vicegerent. Here, however, all traces of them disappear. The Martyrologist spared no pains for their recovery: and Cromwell's papers in the Chapter-House at Westminster have recently been searched; but not a vestige of the manuscript can be found[3]; and it is greatly to be feared that it has utterly perished. The loss is chiefly to be lamented, as concealing from us the address with which the Archbishop contrived so to temper his reasons with "humble modesty and obedience to his Prince," as to disarm the jealousy and resentment of the King.

Among the "Remains" of Cranmer are printed

[1] The principal *points* of this speech are given, ante, vol. i. c. iv. p. 97—99.

[2] Cranmer's Remains, vol. ii. p. 11—15.

[3] Ibid. Editor's Pref. p. xxv. xxvi.

the Homilies of Salvation,—of Faith,—and of Good Works[1]. The grounds for attributing these compositions to him, are abundantly satisfactory. In the first place, we have certain "Notes on Justification, with authorities from Scripture, the Fathers, and the Schoolmen," taken from a manuscript at Lambeth, and now printed for the first time[2]; the whole written by Cranmer's own hand. This document is interesting,—not only as a specimen of the laborious process by which Cranmer was in the habit of searching after truth,—but as exhibiting many remarkable coincidences, both in the manner of setting forth the great Protestant doctrine of Justification, and in the selection of authorities produced in support of it. In the second place, with regard to the Homily of Salvation we have the testimony of Gardiner, who, in his tedious correspondence with the Protector Somerset, repeatedly ascribes that Homily to the Archbishop. In one place he says,—"My Lord of Canterbury hath, in the *Homily of Salvation*, taken such a matter in hand, and hath so handled it, as, if I were an extreme enemy, I could have wished him." And again—"as for my Lord of Canterbury's Homily of Salvation, it has as many faults as I have been weeks in prison, which be seven!" Another testimony extends to all three of these Homilies,—namely, the testimony of Bishop Woolton, nephew of the celebrated Alexander Nowell, whose language, in the Christian Manual, published

[1] Remains, vol. ii. p. 138—177. [2] Ibid. p. 121—137.

in 1576, is as follows:—"What we teach and think of good works, those Homilies, written in an English tongue, of Salvation, Faith, and Works, by that light and martyr of Christ's Church, Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury, do plainly testify and declare[1]." Other Homilies, besides these three, have likewise been ascribed to the pen of the Archbishop. But the evidence in support of such conjectures has not been deemed sufficient to entitle them to a place among his undoubted compositions[2].

It might perhaps be expected that the treatise usually known by the title of "Cranmer's Catechism," would appear in a collection of his works. It is, however, indisputable, that the work was not his own, although he gave it the sanction of his name; and it is by no means certain that even the translation was executed by the Archbishop. It has, indeed, been generally supposed that certain passages in the version, of which no vestige appears in the original, must have been inserted by Cranmer; for instance, a discourse of some length against image-worship, and a fervent exhortation to prayer. Nevertheless, as there is no sufficient evidence in support of this presumption, the version of the Catechism has been *altogether* omitted in the recent edition of his Remains[3]. The Prefatory Epistle, however, addressed to Edward VI., was, beyond all

[1] See ante, vol. i. p. 284, note (2). Cranmer's Remains, vol. ii. p. 138, note (a). Eccl. Biog. p. 505, 506, note (7).

[2] Remains, vol. ii. p. 138, note (a).

[3] Ibid. Editor's Preface, p. liv. lv.

question, written by Cranmer, and is accordingly inserted among his Letters [1].

The short treatise on "*Unwritten Verities*," printed anonymously in 1548, has usually been numbered among the compositions of Cranmer, on the authority of Strype [2]. But as no proof has been produced by him in maintenance of this opinion, it has been rejected from the undoubted writings of the Archbishop, in the recent edition, but is printed in the Appendix [3].

There is, indeed, a much larger treatise, entitled a "Confutation of Unwritten Verities," which has usually been placed among the writings of Cranmer. It was put forth in 1557, by an exile designating himself by the initials E. P.; and it professed to be a translation from the Latin of the Archbishop. It is probable that this treatise was confounded by Strype with the shorter tract in question. But, further, even the "Confutation" itself is not wholly free from suspicion. In the first place, it has not been ascertained that this work ever was *printed* in Latin; and secondly, the preface, the conclusion, and some passages in the body of the work, undoubtedly belong to the translator. It has, nevertheless, been inserted among the genuine Remains of Cranmer [4]; principally on the ground, that there

[1] Vol. i. p. 326. Lett. 271.

[2] Cranmer, b. ii. c. 5; and Eccl. Mem. vol. ii. c. 17, and Append. AA.

[3] Remains, vol. iv. p. 358.

[4] Vol. iv. p. 151. 244.

is, among his common-place books, in the British Museum, a sort of draft or outline of a treatise on the subject, together with a collection of authorities, arranged under the same heads as in the "Confutation." These notes are accordingly prefixed to the treatise itself[1].

The celebrated answer of the Archbishop to the Western rebels, in 1549, is, of course, inserted among his works; and it is printed accurately from the original draft, in the hand-writing of the Archbishop, at C.C. College, Cambridge[2]. It is followed by a sermon on Rebellion, now printed for the first time[3], from the same collection, and supposed to have been delivered by the Archbishop at Court, on a fast-day, appointed in consequence of the Norfolk insurrection. Prefixed to this sermon, are certain rough notes, the topics of which are similar to those which are treated of in the sermon itself: and there is reason to believe that these notes were first placed in the hands of Peter Martyr, and by him expanded into a regular Latin composition; and that the Sermon was afterwards drawn up in English, by the Archbishop himself, from the materials thus prepared for him[4]. If we except those of the Homilies, which he is believed to have composed, this is the only extant discourse of Cranmer. The grievances of the Devonshire rebels, it will be recollected,

[1] Vol. iv. p. 147—150.
[2] Remains, vol. ii. p. 202—244. [3] Ibid. 248.
[4] See the Editor's Preface, p. lxxi; and vol. ii. p. 248, note (a).

were principally of a religious nature[1]. The complaints of the Norfolk insurgents related chiefly to political abuses: but it is intimated in the Archbishop's Notes, that "these tumults were first excited by the Papists, and others, from the Western camp; to the end that, by sowing divisions among ourselves, we should not be able to impeach them." The Sermon in question deals out rebuke, impartially, to all orders of men. It ascribes a great part of the disturbances to idle and sturdy ruffians, who regard neither God nor man, and who seek for nothing but to fatten on the pillage of the industrious and the peaceable: but it likewise stigmatizes, without sparing, the avarice and the oppression which disgraced the higher ranks. But "the head and beginning of tribulations" is represented by him to be, the deplorable state of the public morals. "The Gospel of God," says the preacher, "now set forth to the whole realm, is of many so hated, that it is rejected, refused, reviled, and blasphemed, and by those which have received the same, and would be counted great favourers thereof, yet it sustaineth much injury and reproach, and, by their occasion, is ill spoken of. For the great number of them, pretending a zeal thereto in their lips, and not in their hearts, counterfeiting godliness in name, but not in deed, live after their own pleasure, like Epicures, and so ungodly as though there were no God. And what is that St. Paul calleth having God's truth in unrighteousness, if this be not

[1] See ante, vol. i. c. xi. p. 325, 326.

it? These, having more knowledge of God than they had before, and receiving a taste of the heavenly gifts, notwithstanding retain their old vices in their corrupt manners and dissolute conversation, being nothing amended but rather payred [impaired?] . . . . . And shall God's judgment leave them unpunished, which always having in their mouth *the Gospel, the Gospel*, reasoning of it, and bragging of it, yet in their conversation live after the world, the flesh, and the Devil?"—Again, "if we receive and repute the Gospel as a thing most true and godly, why do we not live according to the same? If we count it as fables and trifles, why do we take upon us to give such credit and authority unto it? To what purpose tendeth such dissimulation and hypocrisy? If we take it for a Canterbury tale, why do we not refuse it; why do we not laugh it out of place, and whistle at it? Why do we with words approve it, with conscience receive and allow it, give credit unto it, repute and take it as a thing most true, wholesome, and godly, and in our living clearly reject it? Brethren, God will not be mocked. For this cause did God so severely and grievously punish the Jews above all other nations. And sith our cause is like and the same, the self-same ire and displeasure of God is now provoked and kindled against us [1]."

We have here, from the Primate of England himself, a mournful testimony, similar to that which was often lifted up by his associates in the work of Re-

[1] Vol. ii. p. 264, 266.

formation, against the abounding iniquity of those days. All this, however, is little more than might have been expected. Between the removal of superstitious restraint, and the return to a more scriptural system, a fearful *interregnum* would unavoidably ensue; and during that interval, many lamentable symptoms of moral anarchy would manifest themselves. The controul of the Priest, and the dread of penance or of purgatory, would, in numberless instances, be withdrawn, before the passions could be brought into captivity to a more sound and perfect discipline. Men would begin to rejoice in their liberty, before they could know and feel that Christ alone could safely and effectually set them free. But what was the inference drawn by Cranmer and his fellow-labourers from these discouraging appearances? It never tempted them, for a moment, to doubt the goodness of their own cause. It never suggested to them a thought of going back to the chambers of imagery, or to the den of sorceries. It produced no other effect, than that of urging them to more intense labour in hastening the period, when the true and heavenly wisdom should be fully justified of her children.

One word, in this place, and one word only, as to the swarm of sects, and the licence of theological speculation, which the Roman Catholics frequently insist upon as another fatal reproach to the Protestant cause. It is obvious that a full discussion of this subject would plunge the inquirer into a wide and troubled ocean of controversy. It will be sufficient,

however, for the intelligent Protestant to recollect, that uniformity itself would be far too dearly purchased by the sacrifice of liberty, and truth, and charity; that, if Romanism be false, the divisions among Protestants cannot make it true; that, when we compare together the varieties of the Reformed Faith, we seldom "find the rent descending to the foundation;" that, desirable as perfect unity must, at all times, appear to us, it would seem to be a blessing reserved by Providence for the last and brightest period of the Church; that, while the footsteps of our Lord were still fresh upon the earth, his mystical body began to be agitated and torn with heresies, the variety of which at length bewildered the understanding, and oppressed the memory; and that, since that time, the period of the greatest apparent concord has, perhaps, been that of the lowest moral and intellectual degeneracy. And if it should be insisted that the very want of agreement is, itself, conclusive evidence of falsehood,—it may be replied, that to assert this, is virtually to assume the main point in debate; namely, that where there is any difference of belief whatever, there the unity of the Faith is fatally violated. It may, we fear, be justly added, that the Atheism and Infidelity which often lurk in the high places and learned retreats of *Catholicism*, are evils quite as deadly, to say the least, as the dissensions incident to Protestant freedom. The former may be likened to a rank corruption, which, "mining all within, infects unseen:" the other to a violent fermentation, which may send forth noxious vapours,

indeed, but which tends, as we humbly trust, to a state of final purity and perfection.

A considerable portion of the second volume, and the whole of the third volume, of "Cranmer's Remains," are occupied by his celebrated controversy on the Eucharist. Of this controversy some account has already been given in a former chapter[1] of the present work. It is remarkable enough, that it is but of late years that Cranmer's *Defence*[2] has been reprinted; and that there had been no republication of the Answer to Gardiner, until the recent Oxford edition of his Writings. In fact, it must always be a matter of considerable difficulty to secure the attention of modern readers to the progress and the conduct of a theological debate like this. In our times, a dispute on the subject of Transubstantiation might possibly appear to most Protestants, very much like a controversy relative to judicial Astrology, or the transmutation of metals, or the elixir of immortality. In order, therefore, to estimate duly the service rendered by Archbishop Cranmer to the cause of truth and common sense, we must carry back our thoughts to the period in which he wrote. It has already been shown that, in that age, the Church of Rome contended for her Sacramental Doctrine, as she would

[1] Ante, c. xiii.—A very ample and luminous account of it may be found in the Editor's Preface to Cranmer's Remains, p. lxvii—ciii.

[2] It has been once reprinted in 1809, in the third vol. of the *Fathers of the English Church*; and again, in 1825, with an Historical and Critical Introduction, by Mr. Todd.

contend for her dominion, or rather for her very life. The difference between right and wrong views, respecting that question, could, in her judgment, be measured by nothing short of the difference between peace and security on the one hand, or a frightfully painful death on the other. The affair was not, therefore, in those days, as it frequently is in ours, regarded as a matter of empty speculation. It was a question which might come to involve the personal safety of every individual in the realm. It was, consequently, an object of the highest importance to have the Sacramental *theory* correctly exhibited, and fully understood. The resources of Logic, or Metaphysics, or Antiquarian research, could not, then, be bestowed on any topic of more vital moment to any Christian community. And if this be steadily kept in mind, we shall be better able to estimate justly the services which Cranmer attempted to render to the world, by his writings on the Eucharist,—services which he actually did render, beyond any theological writer of his day.

It is to be remarked, that, in this controversy, the Archbishop perpetually contends for something more than a *bare* commemoration of our Saviour's passion, in the Sacramental rite. He maintains, as the Church of England now maintains, that the body of Christ is *really and verily*, though spiritually, received by the faithful. And, that there might be no mistake as to the manner of this reception, he likewise contends, that the flesh and blood of Christ *might* have been received, conformably to John vi., even if the Sacra-

ment had never been ordained. The Eucharist was therefore regarded by him as an occasion on which the efficacy and benefit of the one great sacrifice are more powerfully and abundantly conveyed to the soul of the believer, than by any other act of devotion. To signify this blessed effect by the figure of eating the flesh of Christ, and drinking his blood, might appear to us like a hazardous experiment in language, if the words were now to be used for the first time. But these words, it should be remembered, were originally addressed to persons whose minds were full of thoughts and images, connected with sacrificial solemnity, and who would be likely enough to understand them with reference to such occasions. And they who understood them in their most gross and literal sense, were doubtless the very persons who found the saying hard, and walked with our Lord no more.

It has been asserted, of late, that it is a mere vulgar error to charge the Romish doctrine with contradicting the senses. And, assuredly, if it be once allowed that qualities may subsist, after the substance, to which they belong, has been removed or destroyed, the senses (which take no cognizance of substances separately from their accidents,) must be unable to judge whether the substance has been changed or not: and, in that case, it may be scarcely accurate to say that the miraculous change is negatived by the evidence of the senses. But still it will be true that the miracle in question must labour under a disadvantage peculiar to itself: it must be distinguished from

all other miracles by this extraordinary circumstance, —that, whether it has been performed or not, our senses will be unable to inform us. Nay, more, if the senses are appealed to *at all*, they must, infallibly, pronounce against the performance of it. And this, probably, is all that is ever meant, when it is said, that our senses are in opposition to the doctrine. Mankind, in general, are so constituted, or so educated, as to conclude that different substances are indicated by different sensible attributes: and when violence is done to this universal persuasion, it may reasonably be affirmed that our senses are contradicted. It may, perhaps, be said that it is their province to remain neutral in the affair. But their very neutrality must, of itself, produce much of the effect of positively adverse testimony; this being the only case of miraculous agency in which they are compelled to be silent. A miracle must be of a very suspicious character, which excludes those witnesses, to which all other miracles openly and confidently appeal.

That the absurdity of an utter separation between substance and accident, did not escape the metaphysicians of the sixteenth century, is obvious from the following exposure of it by Cranmer: "The substance of the bread and wine, as they affirm, be clean gone. And so there remaineth whiteness, but nothing is white: there remaineth colours, but nothing is coloured therewith: there remaineth roundness, but nothing is round: and there is bigness, but nothing is big: there is sweetness, without any sweet

thing: breaking, without any thing broken; division, without any thing being divided: and so, other qualities and quantities, without any thing to receive them. *And this doctrine they teach as a necessary article of faith*[1] *!*"

In the fourth volume of Cranmer's Remains, the only compositions which can with strict propriety be called his own, (with the exception of certain public instruments and letters of his in the Appendix,) are the declaration concerning the Mass, which led to his imprisonment—the Prayer, Exhortation, and confession of Faith at St. Mary's, Oxford, on the day of his martyrdom,—and the "Confutation of Unwritten Verities," before adverted to, (if that treatise is rightly ascribed to him). The rest consists of his Disputations and Examinations, in the reign of Mary, with various papers arising out of them. The report of these proceedings has been, very properly, reprinted from Foxe, with some few additions from other authorities: for although the account preserved to us by the Martyrologist, even according to his own statement, cannot be throughout implicitly relied upon, it is yet the best which his diligence was able to procure; and, without some record of the manner in which the Archbishop acquitted himself in that period of heavy trial, a collection of his Remains would be manifestly imperfect. It is well known that the Papists fully expected that the exhibition would be utterly discreditable to his learning and his

[1] "Defence," &c.; Cranmer's Remains, vol. ii p. 309.

abilities; and even his friends were not without apprehension lest his self-possession should be fatally confounded by the turbulence of a public debate, and by the overbearing violence both of his antagonists and his judges. The hopes of the one party, and the fears of the other, were completely disappointed by his performance. His energy and promptness might, indeed, be inferior to those of Ridley; but the resources displayed by him were such as abundantly to show, that the current reports respecting the meanness of his intellect, and the poverty of his acquirements, had been circulated wholly by ignorance or malice.

It appears, indeed, that even in later, as well as earlier times, a very moderate estimate has sometimes been adopted, respecting the capacity of Cranmer. It is affirmed, for instance, by Burnet, that "he had a good judgment, but no great quickness of apprehension, or closeness of style, which was diffused and unconnected; therefore, when any thing was to be penned that required more nerves, he made use of Ridley." It has been shown above, that Ridley himself disclaimed this honour. With regard to the Archbishop's style, it may indeed be allowed, that it is by no means very eminent for point, or compression. To a modern apprehension, its chariot wheels may seem at times to linger and drag heavily. There is occasionally something of an Alexandrine length and slowness in his sentences, which may try the patience of a reader, who is eager to *get on* with the discussion. On the other hand, however, it must be allowed, that his diction, though not always remark-

ably bright or animated, is uniformly perspicuous, and not unfrequently dignified and impressive. In those compositions, more especially, which were diligently prepared by him for the public eye, it was the expression of a mind conscious of a complete mastery over its subject. It generally indicates the presence of that self-possession, which enables a man to march deliberately through the debateable region, and to fix his eye steadily on every position which it may be expedient for him to occupy. There is about it no appearance of precipitation or bewilderment; nothing which can lead to the suspicion, that there are weak points, here and there, which the writer was secretly anxious to hurry over. His diffuseness is that of an inquirer, whose mind has surveyed the disputed question in its height, and depth, and length, and breadth, and who is desirous of imparting to the reader the full result of his own laborious investigations. His style, in short, may be advantageously compared with that of almost any contemporary writer; and will appear with an aspect of decided superiority, when contrasted with the pedantry and affectation which often disfigured the writings of the period immediately succeeding his own.

The following Table of Contents will put the reader in possession of the materials of the recent Oxford edition of Archbishop Cranmer's Remains.

The articles marked with an asterisk have now (to the best of the editor's knowledge and belief) been printed for the first time.

VOL. I.

VOL. II.

VOL. IV.

"The Submissions and Recantations" of Cranmer are, very properly, placed, by the Editor, in his Appendix. The attention of the reader is particularly requested, to the Appendix to the present Volume, No. 5, which will surely enable him to see how grossly injurious it would have been to the memory of the Archbishop, to place these very apocryphal documents among his undoubted "Remains."

It may be stated here, that the Editor has rendered an invaluable service to all, who wish to study the controversy between Cranmer and Gardyner, by printing, in the original languages, a collection of authorities cited by the parties, generally in English, in the course of the dispute. This collection will be found in vol. iv. Appendix, p. 401—439.

In explanation of the order in which Cranmer's Answer to Gardyner is arranged[1], it must be observed, that the Romanists usually contended for the necessity of first discussing the real corporeal presence, and other points connected with it; and then proceeding to transubstantiation: for, if the former were once established, the way would be better prepared for the establishment of the latter also. In Cranmer's Treatise, transubstantiation stood first: in his Answer, he accommodates himself to the order adopted by his antagonists; and takes Gardyner's remarks on the second book, after those on the third and fourth.

[1] See the bottom of the preceding page 328.

APPENDIX.

No. I.

ADDENDA ET CORRIGENDA, TO VOL. I.

In vol. i. c. iv. p. 93, the letter of Cranmer to Henry VIII., in which he reports his Sermons on the King's Supremacy, is represented as written in August, 1535. But the editor of Cranmer's Remains has produced good reasons for believing that it was not written till August, 1536.—See Remains, vol. i. p. 167. Lett. 171, note (k).

It is stated in vol. i. c. vi. p. 148, that the order for placing the Bible in Churches was inserted in Cromwell's Injunctions, of 1535. It is, however, remarked in the note to p. 148, that this article of the Injunctions is to be found in Collier *only*, (vol. ii. p. 129,) and not in Burnet or in Wilkins. It now appears, that this order is not to be found in the official copy of Cranmer's Register; and it is further suggested by the editor of Cranmer's Remains, that its appearance in 1536 is scarcely to be reconciled with a letter from Grafton, the printer, to Cromwell, in 1537, urgently begging that the Bible printed by him might be licenced.—Strype's Cranmer, b. i. c. 15. The probability therefore is, that the Article, as given by Collier, is an interpolation, adopted incautiously from a draft which was afterwards altered; and that no order was actually issued for placing the English Bible in Churches before Cromwell's Injunctions of 1538.—See Cranmer's Remains, vol. i. p. 200, note (i).

The designs of Cranmer, relative to the Prebendal preferments, have been alluded to in the first volume of this work, c. viii. p. 197—199. They are more fully developed

in the following scheme, drawn up by him for his own Church at Canterbury; which is printed from Cranmer's Remains, p. 291, together with the letter to Cromwell to which it is appended.

"CCLIV. To Crumwell.

Cotton MSS. Cleop. E. iv. fol. 302. *Original.*

"My very singular good Lord, after my most hearty commendations; these shall be to advertise your Lordship, that I have received your letters dated the xxvii. day of November; and therewith a bill concerning the device[1] for the new

[1] "[The following is the design on which Cranmer comments: it is preserved in the same manuscript. Hen. VIII. was probably proud of it; for Sadler, his ambassador in Scotland, was directed to lay it before James V., as an example of the useful purposes to which the revenues of religious houses might be applied. See Sadler's *State Papers.*

" *Christ Church, in Canterbury.*	£.	s.	d.
First, A provost	150	0	0
Item, Twelve prebendaries, every of them at 40*l.* by the year, sum	480	0	0
Item, Six preachers, every of them 20*l.* a year .	120	0	0
Item, A reader of humanity, in Greek, by year	30	0	0
Item, A reader in divinity in Hebrew, by year	30	0	0
Item, A reader both in divinity and humanity, in Latin, by the year . . .	40	0	0
Item, A reader of civil . . .	20	0	0.
Item, A reader of physic . . .	20	0	0
Item, Twenty students in divinity, to be found ten at Oxford, and ten at Cambridge, every of them 10*l.* by the year	200	0	0
Item, Sixty scholars to be taught both grammar and logic in Hebrew, Greek, and Latin, every of them five marks by the year . .	200	0	0
Item, A school-master 20*l.* and an usher 10*l.* by the year	30	0	0

establishment to be made in the metropolitan church of Canterbury; by which your Lordship requireth mine advice upon by writing, for our mutual consents.

"Surely, my Lord, as touching the book drawn and the order of the same, I think that it will be a very substantial and godly foundation; nevertheless in my opinion the prebendaries which he allowed 40*l.* a piece yearly, might

	£.	s.	d.
Item, Eight petty canons to sing in the choir, every of them 10*l.* by the year . . .	80	0	0
Item, Twelve laymen to sing also, and serve in the choir, every of them 6*l.* 13*s.* 4*d.* by the year	80	0	0
Item, ten choristers, every of them five marks by the year	33	2	4
Item, A master of the childern . .	10	0	0
Item, A gospeler	6	13	4
Item, An epistler	5	6	8
Item, Two sacristans	6	13	4
Item, One chief butler, his wages and diets .	4	13	4
Item, One under butler, his wages and diets .	3	6	8
Item, A cater to buy their diets, for his wages, diets, and making of his books . . .	6	13	0
Item, One chief cook, his wages and diets . .	4	13	0
Item, One under cook, his wages and diets .	3	6	8
Item, two porters	10	0	0
Item, Twelve poor men, being old and serving men, decayed by the wars, or in the King's service, every of them at 6*l.* 13*s.* 4*d.* by the year .	80	0	0
Item, To be distributed yearly in alms .	100	0	0
Item, For yearly reparations . . .	100	0	0
Item, Six to be employed yearly, for making and emending of highways . . .	40	0	0
Item, A steward of the lands . . .	6	13	4
Item, An auditor	10	0	0
Item, For the provost's expenses in receiving the rents and surveying the lands, by the year	6	13	4"]

be altered to a more expedient use. And this is my consideration; for having experience both in times past and also in our days, how the said sect of prebendaries have not only spent their time in much idleness, and their substance in superfluous belly cheer, I think it not to be a convenient state or degree to be maintained and established. Considering first, that commonly a prebendary is neither a learner, nor teacher, but a good viander. Then by the same name they look to be chief, and to bear all the whole rule and pre-eminence in the college where they be resident: by means whereof the younger, of their own nature given more to pleasure, good cheer, and pastime, than to abstinence, study, and learning, shall easily be brought from their books to follow the appetite and example of the said prebendaries, being their heads and rulers. And the state of prebendaries hath been so excessively abused, that when learned men hath been admitted unto such room, many times they have desisted from their good and godly studies, and all other Christian exercise of preaching and teaching. Wherefore, if it may so stand with the King's gracious pleasure, I would wish that not only the name of a prebendary were exiled his Grace's foundations, but also the superfluous conditions of such persons. I cannot deny but that the beginning of prebendaries was no less purposed for the maintenance of good learning and good conversation of living, than religious men were: but forasmuch as both be gone from their first estate and order, and the one is found like offender with the other, it maketh no great matter if they perish both together: for to say the truth, it is an estate which St. Paul, reckoning up the degrees and estates allowed in his time, could not find in the Church of Christ. And I assure you, my Lord, that I think it will better stand with the maintenance of Christian religion, that in the stead of the said prebendaries, were twenty divines at

10*l*. a piece, like as it is appointed to be at Oxford and Cambridge; and forty students in the tongues and sciences and French, to have 10 marks a piece; for if such a number be not there resident, to what intent should so many readers be there? And surely it were great pity that so many good lectures should be there read in vain: for as for your prebendaries, they cannot attend to apply lectures, for making of good cheer. And as for your sixty children in grammar, their master and their usher be daily otherwise occupied in the rudiments of grammar, than that they may have space and time to hear the lectures. So that to these good lectures is prepared no convenient auditory. And therefore, my Lord, I pray you let it be considered, what a great loss it will be to have so many good lectures read without profit to any, saving to the six preachers. Farther, as concerning the reader of divinity and humanity, it will not agree well that one man should be a reader of both lectures. For he that studieth in divinity, must leave the reading of profane authors, and shall have as much to do as he can, to prepare his lecture to be substantially read. And in like manner, he that readeth in humanity, had not need to alter his study, if he should make an erudite lecture. And therefore in mine opinion it would be two offices for two sundry learned men."

The formulary of 1540 (adverted to in chap. viii. vol. i. p. 223—225,) is not now to be found. Although the Archbishop had succeeded in obtaining the King's approbation of it, the Romish party may have had sufficient influence, by some means or other, to suppress it. We have seen that Strype has printed six Articles, which he assumes to be a part of that Formulary. (Ante, vol. i. p. 225, note (1). But there seems to be no very substantial grounds for this assumption.—See Editor's Preface to Cranmer's Remains, p. xxiii—xxxi.

The latter part of the paragraph in vol. i. chap. vi. p. 152, 153, was written under the impression that the corrections of the Institution, &c., or Bishops' Book, and the Annotations of Cranmer on those corrections, were made previously to the publication of that Formulary, in 1536. But it is now clear that both the *Corrections* and the *Annotations* were written, by the King and the Archbishop respectively, after the publication of the Book, (which was put forth without the Royal authority,) at a time when it was in contemplation to republish it with the King's name and sanction.—See Cranmer's Remains, Editor's Preface, p. xviii; and vol. ii. p. 21, and p. 96, note. This subject has been, already, more fully adverted to Ante, c. xvii. of *this* volume.

In chap. vi. vol. i. p. 155, allusion is made to the toil and anxiety incident to the compilation of the *Bishops' Book*. This has been further illustrated by the Editor of Cranmer's Remains, who had referred to certain Letters, published in the State Papers, and addressed to Cromwell by Bishops Fox and Latimer, two of the Commissioners employed in the work. From these Letters it appears that there was great difficulty in coming to an agreement. Latimer prays God, "that when it is done, it may be well and sufficiently done, so that we shall not need to have any more such doings: for verily, for my part, I had lever [rather] be poor Parson of poor Kynton again, than to continue thus Bishop of Worcester. Not for any thing that I have had to do therein, or can do: but yet, forsooth, it is a troublous thing to agree upon a doctrine in things of such controversy, with judgments of such diversity; every man, I trust meaning well, and yet not all meaning one way. But I doubt not, but now in the end, we shall agree both one with the other, and all with the truth, though some will then marvel." . . . . Cran-

mer and Fox are represented to have taken the lead in the discussions; and the latter, when the book was completed, undertook to superintend the printing of it.—"This day," says Latimer, "we had finished, I trow, the rest of our Book, if my Lord of Hereford had not been diseased; to whom surely we owe great thanks, for his great diligence in all our proceedings. Upon Monday, I think, it will be dône altogether; and then my Lord of Canterbury will send it unto your Lordship with all speed: to whom, also, if any thing be praiseworthy, *bona pars laudis optime jure debetur.*"—The heat of the debates is sufficiently indicated by a remark of Fox, that "they much wanted Cromwell's presence."

When the book was framed, there remained the important question, under what authority it should be issued? Fox besought Cromwell that it might go forth with the King's name. (State Papers, vol. i. p. 556. 562, 563.) The same wish is expressed by the Prelates, in their Preface to the work. (Formularies of Faith in the Reign of Henry VIII. p. 26. Oxf. Edit. 1825.) And a minute of an answer in the affirmative was actually prepared, and is now to be found in the Chapter House, Westminster, Theolog. Tracts, vol. ix. p. 73. It would appear, however, that Henry was, after all, too cautious to commit his authority to the publication; and the consequence was, that the book came out without any other mark of the Royal authority than that of issuing from the press of the King's printer: whereas the *Articles of Religion* which preceded *the Institution*, and the *Necessary Doctrine* which followed it, were, both of them, first approved in Convocation, and were then honoured with a Preface by the King, and declared in the Preface to be set forth by his authority. See Cranmer's Remains, vol. i. p. 187, note (i).

[1] This document is printed in Coll. vol. ii. No. 47.

The exhumation of Becket's remains, complained of by the Pope (as stated in vol. i. c. vii. p. 171, 172), has been grievously exaggerated by Roman Catholic writers. That any part of them were burnt is rendered more than doubtful, by a document in the State Paper Office, called a justification of King Henry's proceedings [1]. According to this paper, "it was asserted, that Becket's shrynes and bones should be bestowed in such a place as should cause no superstition afterwards." It speaks, indeed, of the burning of a certain skull, which was erroneously supposed by some to have been that of the *Martyr*. It has nevertheless been affirmed by Sanders, that Becket was most contumeliously cited to appear and stand his trial for rebellion and treason. And the same thing is still more fully asserted by Chrysostom Henriquez, in a book called Phœnix Reviviscens; in which he gives the whole process, on the authority of F. Girol. Pollini, Istoria della Rivoluzione d'Inghilterra, lib. iii. c. 42 [2]. It is, however, very remarkable, that the King's warrant for the spoliation of the shrine, and the exhumation and burning of the bones, is dated August 11, 1538; whereas there is extant, a letter of Cranmer's to Cromwell, dated seven days later (viz. 18th August), which, without the slightest allusion to the supposed prosecution or sentence, contains the following request,—"By cause that I have in great suspect that St. Thomas of Canterbury his blood, in Christ's Church in Canterbury is but a feigned thing, and made of some red ochre, or some such matter, I beseech your Lordship that Dr. Leigh and Dr. Barber, my Chaplains, may have the King's Commission to try and examine that and other like things there." Now, surely, if the King's warrant had been obtained on the 11th of August, for executing the process against Becket, there could be no

[1] See Wilk. Concil. vol. iii. p. 835, 836.

necessity, on the 18th of August, for the King's Commission to examine into the tricks practised at the shrine of the Saint. It is further stated by Pollini, that the execution of the sentence took place on the 19th of August; whereas it is absolutely certain, that the removal of the treasure did not take place till the following September. These circumstances must be allowed to throw great discredit on the story produced by Henriquez from Pollini, however circumstantially the facts may be related [1].

In c. xi. vol. i. p. 311, 312, it is said that certain passages were introduced by Cranmer himself into the version of Jonas's Catechism. This, however, is doubted by the Editor of Cranmer's Remains; who, accordingly, has rejected those passages from a place in his writings. See Editor's Preface, p. liv.

In c. xi. vol. i. p. 316, it should have been stated, that even in the time of Henry VIII., some alteration of the Services had been in contemplation. See Cranmer's Remains, vol. i. p. 241, note (r), Letter 216.

It has already been mentioned, in c. xviii., that Cranmer's book on the Divorce, written by him at the King's command, in 1529, is now lost: and that the same fate has befallen his Arguments against the Six Articles, also drawn up by the desire of Henry. The most diligent research has been unable to recover any fragments of either. See Cranmer's Remains, Editor's Preface, p. viii. xxvi.

[1] See Cranmer's Remains, vol. i. p. 262.; and the Editor's note (h) relative to this subject.

No. II.

The original Latin of Cranmer's Letter of invitation to Martin Bucer, is printed in Strype's Cranmer, Appendix, No. 43. The following is a translation of it:

"The grace and peace of God be with you. I have read your letters to John Hales, in which you relate the disastrous events in Germany, and write that you are unable any longer to preside over the ministry of the word, in your own city. I have, therefore, with groans, exclaimed, in the words of the Prophet, *shew forth the wonders of thy mercy, Thou that dost save all that hope in thee, from them that resist thy right hand.* Neither do I doubt, but that God will hear this, and the like groanings of pious men; and will preserve and defend the true doctrine, which has hitherto been sincerely propagated in your Churches, against all the fury of the devil and the world. In the mean time, while the storm is raging, they who cannot venture out to sea, must fly into port. To you, therefore, my friend Bucer, our kingdom will be the safest harbour; in which, by the blessing of God, the seeds of true doctrine have begun to be scattered abroad. Come, then, to us; and become a labourer with us in the harvest of the Lord. You will not be less profitable to the Catholic Church of God, when you are among us, than if you were to retain your former position. Besides, you will, when absent, be better able to heal the wounds of your own afflicted country, than you now can, being present. Put aside, therefore, all delay, and repair to us as soon as possible. We will show that nothing can be more welcome or delightful to us than the presence of Bucer. But be careful that you suffer no inconvenience on your journey. You well know the enemies that will pursue you on your way: see that you do not commit yourself to their hands. There is a merchant,

one Richard Hils, a man signally religious and trustworthy, with whom you may confer concerning the whole arrangement of your journey. Further, with my whole heart, I pray to the Eternal God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, that, in his wrath, he will remember mercy, and look on the calamities of the afflicted Church, and kindle the light of the true doctrine among us more and more. With you it has now been shining for many years, and He will not suffer it to be extinguished. May He, my friend Bucer, direct and preserve you, and bring you to us in safety. Farewell. London, 2nd Oct. 1548.—Your arrival is heartily desired by Thomas Cranmer, Archiep. Cantuar."

No. III.

From Miles Coverdale's Preface to the Letters of the Martyrs. London, 1564.

"UNTO them that love him, God causeth all things to worke for the best. So that with Him, by the heavenly light of stedfast faith, they see life even in death; with Him, even in heaviness and sorrow, they fail not of joy and comfort; with Him, even in poverty, affliction, and trouble, they neither perish, nor are forsaken. How else could they be so patient, so quiet of minde, so cherefull and merye, in adversitie and straite captiuitie: some beying throwne into dungeons, by some holes, darke, loathesome, and stinking corners: other some lying in fetters and chaynes, and loaded with so many irons that they could scarcely styrre: some tied in the stocks with their heeles upwarde; some hauyng their legges in the stockes, and their neckes chayned to the walle with gorgets of iron; some both handes and legges in the stockes at once; sometimes both hands in, and both legges out;

sometimes the right hand, with the left leg; or the left hand with the right legge fastened in the stockes, wyth manicles and fetters, hauyng neither stoole nor stone to sitte on, to ease their wofull bodies withall; some standing in most painful engines of iron with their bodies doubled; some whypped and scourged, beate with roddes, and buffeted with fistes: some hauing their handes burned with a candel to trie their patience, or force them to relente: some hunger-pyned, and most miserably famished. All these torments, and many more, even such as cruel Phalaris could not devise worse, wer practised by the papists, the stout sturdy souldiours of Satan, thus delityng in variety of tyranny and torments upon the saints of God, *as it is ful wel and too well knowen, and as many can testify which are yet aliue, and haue felte some smarte thereof.* Yea, and furthermore, so extremely were these deare servantes of God delt withal, that although they were moste desirous by their pen and writing, to edify their brethren, other poore lambes of Christ, and one to comfort another in him,—yet were they so narrowly watched, and straitly kepte from al necessary helpes, as paper, inke, bokes, and such lyke, that great maruail it is how they could be able to write any one of these or other so excellent and worthy letters. For so hardly were they used (as I said afore) for the most part that they could not end their letters begun: sometimes for lacke of ease, being so fettered with chaynes, and otherwise banded as you haye heard; sometimes for lacke of light, when they could neither see to write wel, nor to reade their letters again; and sometime through the hasty coming in of the keepers or officers, who left no corner nor bedstraw unsearched; yea, sometime they were put to so hard shiftes, that lyke as for lacke of pennes they were fayne to write with the lead of the windowes: so for wante of inke they toke their own blood, (as yet it remaineth to be

sene,) and yet sometime they were faine to teare and rent what they had written at the hasty coming in of the officers."

No. IV

To Queen Mary[1].

"It may please your Majesty to pardon my presumption, that I dare be so bold to write to your Highness, but very necessity constraineth me, that your Majesty may know my mind, rather by mine own writing, than by other men's reports. So it is, that upon Saturday, being the seventh day of this month, I was cited to appear at Rome the eightieth day after, there to make answer to such matters as should be objected against me upon the behalf of the King and your most excellent Majesty: which matters the Thursday following were objected against me by Dr. Martin and Dr. Storie, your Majesty's proctors, before the Bishop of Gloucester, sitting in judgment by commission from Rome. But, alas! it cannot but grieve the heart of any natural subject, to be accused of the King and Queen of his own realm, and specially before an outward judge, or by authority coming from any person out of this realm: where the King and Queen, as if they were subjects within their own realm, shall complain, and require justice at a stranger's hands against their own subject, being already condemned to death by their own laws. As though the King and Queen could not do or have justice within their own realms against their own subjects, but they must seek it at a stranger's hands in a strange land; the like whereof, I think, was never seen. I would have wished to have had some meaner adversaries: and I think that death shall not

[1] This is Letter CCXCIX. in Cranmer's Remains, vol. i.

grieve me much more, than to have my most dread and most gracious Sovereign Lord and Lady, (to whom under God I do owe all obedience,) to be mine accusers in judgment within their own realm, before any stranger and outward power. But forasmuch as in the time of the prince of most famous memory, King Henry the Eighth, your Grace's father, I was sworn never to consent that the Bishop of Rome should have or exercise any authority or jurisdiction in this realm of England, therefore, lest I should allow his authority contrary to mine oath, I refused to make answer to the Bishop of Gloucester, sitting here in judgment by the Pope's authority, lest I should run into perjury.

"Another cause why I refused the Pope's authority is this, that his authority, as he claimeth it, repugneth to the crown imperial of this realm, and to the laws of the same, which every true subject is bounden to defend. First, for that the Pope saith, that all manner of power, as well temporal as spiritual, is given first to him of God; and that the temporal power he giveth unto emperors and kings, to use it under him, but so as it be always at his commandment and beck.

"But contrary to this claim, the imperial crown and jurisdiction temporal of this realm is taken immediately from God, to be used under Him only, and is subject unto none, but to God alone.

"Moreover, the imperial laws and customs of this realm, the King in his coronation, and all justices when they receive their offices, be sworn, and all the whole realm is bounden, to defend and maintain. But contrary hereunto, the Pope by his authority maketh void, and commandeth to blot out of our books, all laws and customs being repugnant to his laws; and declareth accursed all rulers and governors, all the makers, writers, and executors of such laws or customs: as it appeareth by many of

the Pope's laws, whereof one or two I shall rehearse. In the Decrees, *Dist.* 10. is written thus, 'Constitutiones contra canones et decreta præsulum Romanorum vel bonos mores, nullius sunt momenti.' That is, 'The constitutions or statutes enacted against the canons and decrees of the bishops of Rome or their good customs, are of none effect.' Also, *Extrav. De Sententia Excommunicationis*, 'Noverit:' 'Excommunicamus omnes hæreticos utriusque sexus, quocunque nomine censeantur, et fautores et receptatores et defensores eorum; nec non et qui de cætero servari fecerint statuta edita et consuetudines introductas contra Ecclesiæ libertatem, nisi ea de capitularibus suis intra duos menses post hujusmodi publicationem sententiæ fecerint amoveri. Item, excommunicamus statutarios, et scriptores statutorum ipsorum, nec non potestates, consules, rectores, et consiliarios locorum, ubi de cætero hujusmodi statuta et consuetudines editæ fuerint vel servatæ; nec non et illos qui secundum ea presumpserint judicare, vel in publicam formam scribere judicata.' That is to say, 'We excommunicate all heretics of both sexes, what name soever they be called by, and their favourers and receptors and defenders; and also them that shall hereafter cause to be observed the statutes and customs made against the liberty of the Church, except they cause the same to be put out of their records and chapters within two months after the publication of this sentence. Also we excommunicate the statute makers and writers of those statutes, and all the potestates, consuls, governors and counsellors of places where such statutes and customs shall be made or kept; and also those that shall presume to give judgment according to them, or to write into public form the matters so adjudged.'

"Now by these laws, if the Bishop of Rome's authority, which he claimeth by God, be lawful, all your Grace's

laws and customs of your realm, being contrary to the Pope's laws, be naught: and as well your Majesty, as your judges, justices, and all other executors of the same, stand accursed among heretics, which God forbid. And yet this curse can never be avoided, if the Pope have such power as he claimeth, until such times as the laws and customs of this realm, being contrary to his laws, be taken away and blotted out of the law books. And although there be many laws of this realm contrary to the laws of Rome, yet I named but a few; as to convict a clerk before any temporal judge of this realm for debt, felony, murder, or for any other crime; which clerks by the Pope's laws be so exempt from the King's laws, that they can be no where sued but before their ordinary.

"Also the Pope by his laws may give all bishoprics and benefices spiritual, which by the laws of this realm can be given but only by the King and other patrons of the same, except they fall into the lapse:

"By the Pope's laws, *jus patronatus* shall be sued only before the ecclesiastical judge, but by the laws of this realm it shall be sued before the temporal judges.

"And to be short, the laws of this realm do agree with the Pope's laws like fire and water. And yet the Kings of this realm have provided for their laws by the *præmunire;* so that if any man have let the execution of the laws of this realm by any authority from the see of Rome, he falleth into the *præmunire.*

"But to meet with this, the Popes have provided for their laws by cursing. For whosoever letteth the Pope's laws to have full course within this realm, by the Pope's power standeth accursed. So that the Pope's power treadeth all the laws and customs of this realm under his feet, cursing all that execute them, until such time as they give place unto his laws.

"But it may be said, that notwithstanding all the Pope's

decrees, yet we do execute still the laws and customs of this realm. Nay, not all quietly without interruption of the Pope. And where we do execute them, yet we do it unjustly, if the Pope's power be of force, and for the same we stand excommunicate, and shall do, until we leave the execution of our own laws and customs. Thus we be well reconciled to Rome, allowing such authority, whereby the realm standeth accursed before God, if the Pope have any such authority.

"These things, as I suppose, were not fully opened in the parliament house, when the Pope's authority was received again within this realm; for if they had, I do not believe that either the King or Queen's Majesty, or the nobles of this realm, or the commons of the same, would ever have consented to receive again such a foreign authority, so injurious, hurtful, and prejudicial, as well to the crown as to the laws and customs, and state of this realm, as whereby they must needs acknowledge themselves to be accursed. But none could open this matter well but the clergy, and that such of them as had read the Pope's laws, whereby the Pope hath made himself as it were a god. These seek to maintain the Pope, whom they desired to have their chief head, to the intent they might have as it were a kingdom and laws within themselves, distinct from the laws of the crown, and wherewith the crown may not meddle; and so being exempt from the laws of the realm, might live in this realm like lords and kings, without damage or fear of any man, so that they please their high and supreme head at Rome. For this consideration, I ween, some that knew the truth held their peace in the parliament, whereas if they had done their duties to the crown and whole realm, they should have opened their mouths, declared the truth, and showed the perils and dangers that might ensue to the crown and realm.

"And if I should agree to allow such authority within

this realm, whereby I must needs confess that your most gracious Highness, and also your realm, should ever continue accursed, until you shall cease from the execution of your own laws and customs of your realm; I could not think myself true either to your Highness, or to this my natural country, knowing that I do know. Ignorance, I know, may excuse other men, but he that knoweth how prejudicial and injurious the power and authority, which he challengeth every where, is to the crown, laws, and customs of this realm, and yet will allow the same, I cannot see in any wise, how he can keep his due allegiance, fidelity, and truth to the crown and state of this realm.

"Another cause I alleged why I could not allow the authority of the Pope, which is this, That by his authority he subverteth not only the laws of this realm, but also the laws of God: so that whosoever be under his authority, he suffereth them not to be under Christ's religion purely, as Christ did command. And for one example, I brought forth, that whereas by God's laws all Christian people be bounden diligently to learn his word, that they may know how to believe and live accordingly, for that purpose he ordained holy days, when they ought, leaving apart all other business, to give themselves wholly to know and serve God. Therefore God's will and commandment is, that when the people be gathered together, ministers should use such language as the people may understand and take profit thereby, or else hold their peace. For as an harp or lute, if it give no certain sound that men may know what is stricken, who can dance after it, for all the sound is in vain? so is it in vain and profiteth nothing, saith Almighty God by the mouth of St. Paul, if the priest speak to the people in a language which they know not; for else he may profit himself, but profiteth not the people, saith Saint Paul. But herein I was answered thus; that

Saint Paul spake only of preaching, that the preacher should preach in a tongue which the people did know, or else his preaching availeth nothing. This I would have spoken, and could not be suffered. But if the preaching availeth nothing, being spoken in a language which the people understand not, how should any other service avail them, being spoken in the same language? And yet that Saint Paul meant not only of preaching, it appeareth plainly by his own words. For he speaketh by name expressly of praying, singing, lauding, and thanking of God, and of all other things which the priests say in the churches, whereunto the people say Amen; which they used not in preaching, but in other divine service; that whether the priests rehearse the wonderful works of God, or the great benefits of God unto mankind above all other creatures, or give thanks unto God, or make open profession of their faith, or humble confession of their sins, with earnest request of mercy and forgiveness, or make suit or request unto God for any thing; that then all the people, understanding what the priests say, might give their minds and voices with them, and say Amen, that is to say, allow what the priests say; that the rehearsal of God's universal works and benefits, the giving of thanks, the profession of faith, the confession of sins, and the requests and petitions of the priests and the people might ascend up into the ears of God altogether, and be as a sweet savour, odour, and incense in his nose; and thus was it used many hundred years after Christ's ascension. But the foresaid things cannot be done, when the priests speak to the people in a language not known, and so they (or their clerk in their name) say Amen, but they cannot tell whereunto. Whereas Saint Paul saith, *How can the people say Amen to thy well saying, when they understand not what thou sayest?* And thus was Saint Paul understanden of all interpreters, both the Greeks and Latins,

old and new, school authors and others, that I have read, until about thirty years past. At which time one Eckius, with other of his sort, began to devise a new exposition, understanding St. Paul of preaching only.

"But when a good number of the best learned men reputed within this realm, some favouring the old, some the new learning, as they term it, (where indeed that which they call the old is the new, and that which they call the new is indeed the old;) but when a great number of such learned men of both sorts were gathered together at Windsor, for the reformation of the service of the Church, it was agreed by both, without controversy (not one saying contrary) that the service of the Church ought to be in the mother tongue, and that Saint Paul in the fourteenth chapter to the Corinthians was so to be understanden. And so is Saint Paul to be understanden in the civil law, more than a thousand years past, where Justinianus, a most godly Emperor, in a synod writeth on this manner: 'Jubemus ut omnes episcopi pariter et presbyteri non tacito modo, sed clara voce, quæ a fideli populo exaudiatur, sacram oblationem et preces in sacro baptismate adhibitas celebrent, quo majori exinde devotione in depromendis Domini Dei laudibus audientium animi efferantur. Ita enim et Divus Paulus docet in Epistola ad Corinth. *Si solummodo benedicat spiritus, quomodo is qui privati locum tenet, dicet ad gratiarum actionem tuam, Amen? quandoquidem quid dicas non videt. Tu quidem pulchre gratias agis, alter autem non ædificatur.*' That is to say, 'We command that all bishops and priests celebrate the holy oblation and prayers used in holy baptism, not after a still, close manner, but with a clear, loud voice, that they may be plainly heard of the faithful people, so as the hearers' minds may be lifted up thereby with the greater devotion, in uttering the praises of the Lord God. For so Paul teacheth also in the Epistle

to the Corinthians. *If the spirit do only bless* (or *say well*) *how shall he that occupieth the place of a private person, say, Amen, to thy thanksgiving? for he perceiveth not what thou sayest. Thou dost give thanks well, but the other is not edified.*' And not only the civil law, and all other writers a thousand and five hundred years continually together have expounded Saint Paul not of preaching only, but of other service said in the church; but also reason giveth the same, that if men be commanded to hear any thing, it must be spoken in a language which the hearers understand, or else (as Saint Paul saith) what availeth it to hear? So that the Pope giving a contrary commandment, that the people coming to the church shall hear they wot not what, and shall answer they know not whereto, taketh upon him to command, not only against reason, but also directly against God.

"And again I said, whereas our Saviour Christ ordained the sacrament of his most precious body and blood to be received of all Christian people under the forms both of bread and wine, and said of the cup, *Drink ye all of this*: the Pope giveth a clean contrary commandment, that no lay man shall drink of the cup of their salvation; as though the cup of salvation by the blood of Christ pertained not to lay men. And whereas Theophilus Alexandrinus (whose works Saint Jerome did translate about eleven hundred years past)* saith, 'That if Christ had been crucified for the devils, his cup should not be denied them;' yet the Pope denieth the cup of Christ to Christian people, for whom Christ was crucified. So that if I should obey the Pope in these things, I must needs disobey my Saviour Christ.

"But I was answered hereunto (as commonly the papists do answer) that under the form of bread is whole Christ's flesh and blood: so that whosoever receiveth the form of bread, receiveth as well Christ's blood as his flesh. Let

it be so: yet in the form of bread only, Christ's blood is not drunken, but eaten; nor is it received in the cup in the form of wine, as Christ commanded, but eaten with the flesh under the form of bread. And, moreover, the bread is not the sacrament of his blood, but of his flesh only; nor the cup is not the sacrament of his flesh, but of his blood only. And so the Pope keepeth from all lay persons the sacrament of their redemption by Christ's blood, which Christ commandeth to be given unto them.

And furthermore, Christ ordained the sacrament in two kinds, the one separated from the other, to be a representation of his death, where his blood was separated from his flesh, which is not represented in one kind alone: so that the lay people receive not the whole sacrament, whereby Christ's death is represented, as he commanded.

"Moreover, as the Pope taketh upon him to give the temporal sword, or royal and imperial power, to kings and princes: so doth he likewise take upon him to depose them from their imperial states, if they be disobedient to him, and commandeth the subjects to disobey their princes, assoiling the subjects as well of their obedience as of their lawful oaths made unto their true kings and princes, directly contrary to God's commandment, who commandeth all subjects to obey their kings, or their rulers under them.

"One John, Patriarch of Constantinople in the time of Saint Gregory, claimed superiority above all other bishops. To whom Saint Gregory writeth, that therein he did injury to his three brethren, which were equal with him, that is to say, the Bishop of Rome, the Bishop of Alexandria, and of Antiochia: which three were patriarchal sees as well as Constantinople, and were brethren one to another. 'But (saith St. Gregory) if any one shall exalt himself above all the rest, to be the universal bishop, the same passeth in pride.' But now the Bishop of Rome exalteth

himself not only above all bishops, but also above all kings and emperors, and above all the whole world, taking upon him to give and take away, to set up and put down, as he shall think good. And as the Devil having no such authority, yet took upon him to give unto Christ all the kingdoms of the world, if he would fall down and worship him: in like manner the Pope taketh upon him to give empires and kingdoms being none of his, to such as will fall down and worship him and kiss his feet.

"And moreover his lawyers and glosers so flatter him, that they feign he may command emperors and kings to hold his stirrup when he lighteth upon his horse, and to be his foot-men: and that, if any emperor and king give him any thing, they give him nothing but that is his own, and that he may dispense against God's word, against both the Old and New Testament, against St. Paul's Epistles, and against the Gospel. And furthermore whatsoever he doth, although he draw innumerable people by heaps with himself into hell, yet may no mortal man reprove him, because he being judge of all men, may be judged of no man. And thus he sitteth in the temple of God, as if he were a God, and nameth himself God's vicar, and yet he dispenseth against God. If this be not to play Antichrist's part, I cannot tell what is Antichrist, which is no more to say but Christ's enemy and adversary, who shall sit in the temple of God, advancing himself above all other, yet by hypocrisy and feigned religion shall subvert the true religion of Christ, and under pretence and colour of Christian religion shall work against Christ, and therefore hath the name of Antichrist. Now if any man lift himself higher than the Pope hath done, who lifteth himself above all the world; or can be more adversary to Christ, than to dispense against God's laws, and where Christ hath given any commandment, to command directly the contrary, that man must needs be

taken for Antichrist. But until the time that such a person may be found, men may easily conjecture where to find Antichrist.

"Wherefore, seeing the Pope thus (to overthrow both God's laws and man's laws) taketh upon him to make emperors and kings to be vassals and subjects unto him, and specially the crown of this realm, with the laws and customs of the same; I see no mean how I may consent to admit his usurped power within this realm, contrary to mine oath, mine obedience to God's law, mine allegiance and duty to your Majesty, and my love and affection to this realm

"This that I have spoken against the power and authority of the Pope, I have not spoken (I take God to record and judge) for any malice I owe to the Pope's person, whom I know not, but I shall pray to God to give him grace that he may seek above all things to promote God's honour and glory, and not to follow the trade of his predecessors in these latter days.

"Nor I have not spoken it for fear of punishment, and to avoid the same, thinking it rather an occasion to aggravate than to diminish my trouble; but I have spoken it for my most bounden duty to the crown, liberties, laws, and customs of this realm of England, but most specially to discharge my conscience in uttering the truth to God's glory, casting away all fear by the comfort which I have in Christ, who saith; *Fear not them that kill the body, and cannot kill the soul, but fear him that can cast both body and soul into hell fire.* He that for fear to lose this life will forsake the truth, shall lose the everlasting life: and he that for the truth's sake will spend his life, shall find everlasting life. And Christ promiseth to stand fast with them before his Father, which will stand fast with Him here. Which comfort is so great, that whosoever hath his eyes fixed upon Christ, cannot greatly pass

on this life, knowing that he may be sure to have Christ stand by him in the presence of his Father in heaven.

"And as touching the sacrament, I said; forasmuch as the whole matter standeth in the understanding of these words of Christ: *This is my body, This is my blood;* I said that Christ in these words made demonstration of the bread and wine, and spake figuratively, calling bread his body and wine his blood, because he ordained them to be sacraments of his body and blood. And where the papists say in those two points contrary unto me, that Christ called not bread his body, but a substance uncertain, nor spake figuratively: herein I said I would be judged by the old Church, and which doctrine could be proved the elder, that I would stand unto. And forasmuch as I have alleged in my book many old authors, both Greeks and Latins, which above a thousand years after Christ continually taught as I do; if they could bring forth but one old author, that saith in these two points as they say, I offered six or seven years ago, and do offer yet still, that I will give place unto them.

"But when I bring forth in any author that saith in most plain terms as I do, yet saith the other party, that the authors meant not so; as who should say, that the authors spake one thing, and meant clean contrary. And upon the other part, when they cannot find any one author that saith in words as they say; yet say they, that the authors meant as they say. Now, whether I or they speak more to the purpose herein, I refer me to the judgment of all indifferent hearers: yea, the old Church of Rome, above a thousand years together, neither believed nor used the sacrament as the Church of Rome hath done of late years.

"For in the beginning the Church of Rome taught a pure and a sound doctrine of the sacrament. But after

that the Church of Rome fell into a new doctrine of transubstantiation; with the doctrine they changed the use of the sacrament, contrary to that Christ commanded, and the old Church of Rome used above a thousand years. And yet to deface the old, they say that the new is the old; wherein for my part I am content to stand to the trial. But their doctrine is so fond and uncomfortable, that I marvel that any man would allow it, if he knew what it is. But howsoever they bear the people in hand, that which they write in their books hath neither truth nor comfort.

"For by their doctrine, of one body of Christ is made two bodies; one natural, having distance of members, with form and proportion of man's perfect body, and this body is in heaven; but the body of Christ in the sacrament, by their own doctrine, must needs be a monstrous body, having neither distance of members, nor form, fashion, or proportion of a man's natural body. And such a body is in the sacrament, teach they, and goeth into the mouth with the form of bread, and entereth no farther than the form of bread goeth, nor tarrieth no longer than the form of bread is by natural heat in digesting. So that when the form of bread is digested, that body of Christ is gone. And forasmuch as evil men be as long in digesting as good men, the body of Christ, by their doctrine, entereth as far, and tarrieth as long in wicked men as in godly men. And what comfort can be herein to any Christian man, to receive Christ's unshapen body, and it to enter no farther than the stomach, and to depart by and by as soon as the bread is consumed?

"It seemeth to me a more sound and comfortable doctrine, that Christ hath but one body, and that hath form and fashion of a man's true body; which body spiritually entereth into the whole man, body and soul: and though

the sacrament be consumed, yet whole Christ remaineth, and feedeth the receiver unto eternal life, (if he continue in godliness,) and never departeth until the receiver forsake him. And as for the wicked, they have not Christ within them at all, who cannot be where Belial is. And this is my faith, and (as me seemeth) a sound doctrine, according to God's word, and sufficient for a Christian to believe in that matter. And if it can be showed unto me that the Pope's authority is not prejudicial to the things before mentioned, or that my doctrine in the sacrament is erroneous, which I think cannot be showed, then I never was nor will be so perverse to stand wilfully in mine own opinion, but I shall with all humility submit myself unto the Pope, not only to kiss his feet, but another part also.

"Another cause why I refused to take the Bishop of Gloucester for my judge, was the respect of his own person being more than once perjured. First, for that he being divers times sworn never to consent that the Bishop of Rome should have any jurisdiction within this realm, but to take the King and his successors for supreme heads of this realm, as by God's laws they be: contrary to that lawful oath, the said Bishop sat then in judgment by authority from Rome: wherein he was perjured and not worthy to sit as a judge.

"The second perjury was, that he took his bishopric both of the Queen's Majesty and of the Pope, making to each of them a solemn oath: which oaths be so contrary, that the one must needs be perjured. And furthermore in swearing to the Pope to maintain his laws, decrees, constitutions, ordinances, reservations, and provisions, he declareth himself an enemy to the imperial crown, and to the laws and state of this realm: whereby he declared himself not worthy to sit as a judge within this realm. And for these considerations I refused to take him for my judge. [Sept. 1555.]"

To Queen Mary[1].

" ...... I learned by Dr. Martin, that at the day of your Majesty's coronation you took an oath of obedience to the Pope of Rome, and the same time you took another oath to this realm, to maintain the laws, liberties, and customs of the same. And if your Majesty did make an oath to the Pope, I think it was according to the other oaths which he used to minister to princes; which is to be obedient to him, to defend his person, to maintain his authority, honour, laws, lands, and privileges. And if it be so, (which I know not but by report) then I beseech your Majesty to look upon your oath made to the crown and realm, and to expend and weigh the two oaths together, to see how they do agree, and then to do as your Grace's conscience shall give you: for I am surely persuaded that willingly your Majesty will not offend, nor do against your conscience for no thing. But I fear me that there be contradictions in your oaths, and that those which should have informed your Grace throughly, did not their duties therein. And if your Majesty ponder the two oaths diligently, I think you shall perceive you were deceived; and then your Highness may use the matter as God shall put in your heart.

" Furthermore, I am kept here from company of learned men, from books, from counsel, from pen and ink, saving at this time to write unto your Majesty, which all were necessary for a man being in my case. Wherefore I beseech your Majesty, that I may have such of these as may stand with your Majesty's pleasure. And as for mine appearance at Rome, if your Majesty will give me leave, I will appear there. And I trust that God shall put in my mouth to defend his truth there as well as here. But I refer it wholly to your Majesty's pleasure. [Sept. 1555.] Your poor orator, T. C."

[1] This is Letter CCC. in Cranmer's Remains, vol. i.

No. V.

Cranmer's "Submissions and Recantations."

Of the recantations ascribed to Cranmer, only one seems to have been known to Foxe, namely, that which is now considered as the fifth. Neither does Strype, in his life of Cranmer, allude to any other: but, in his Ecclesiastical Memorials, vol. iii. c. 30, he produces the rest. It has been supposed by some, that his account was taken from the archives of Lambeth; whereas, the archives of Lambeth contain nothing whatever relative to the matter. There is, however, in the library at Lambeth, a scarce volume, (31. 6. 22.) in which a copy of these documents may be found, under the following title: "All the Submyssions and Recantations of Thomas Cranmer, late Archbishop of Canterburye, truly set forth, both in Latin and English, agreeable to the Originalles, written and subscribed with his own hand. *Visum et examinatum per Reverendum Patrem, Dominum Edmundum Episcopum Londin. Anno* MDLVI.—*Excusum Londini, in ædibus Johannis Cawodi, Typographi Regiæ Majestatis. Anno* MDLVI. *Cum privilegio.*" These "Submissions and Recantations" are now printed in the Appendix to the recent Oxford edition of "Cranmer's Remains," vol. iv p. 393—401.

It will be necessary to furnish the reader with these documents in their proper order.

I. The true copy of the first submission of Thomas Cranmer, late Archbishop of Canterbury, *which afterwards, by inconstancy and unstableness, he, the said Thomas Cranmer, did cancel;* the original whereof was sent to the Queen's Majesty and her Privy Council, as followeth:

"Forasmuch as the King and Queen's Majesties, by consent of their Parliament, have received the Pope's

authority within this realm, I am content to submit myself to their laws herein, and to take the Pope to be the chief head of this Church of England, *so far as God's laws, and the laws and customs of this realm will permit.* Thomas Cranmer."

II. The true copy of the second submission of the said Thomas Cranmer, which he the said Thomas did advisedly subscribe with his own hand, *and did not afterwards revoke it*, the original whereof was also sent up to the Queen's Majesty and her said Council, as before:

"I, Thomas Cranmer, Doctor in Divinity, do submit myself to the Catholic Church of Christ, and to the Pope, Supreme Head of the same Church, and unto the King and Queen's Majesties, and unto all their laws and ordinances.—Thomas Cranmer."

III. The third paper of Cranmer, written with his own hand, and by him exhibited, *in Bocardo*, to the Bishop of London [1].

"I am content to submit myself to the King and Queen's Majesties, and to all their laws and ordinances, as well concerning the Pope's Supremacy, as others. And I shall, from time to time, move and stir all other to do the like, to the uttermost of my power; and to live in quietness and obedience unto their Majesties, most humbly, without murmur or grudging against any of their godly proceedings. And, for my book which I have written, I am contented to submit me to the judgment of the Catholic Church, *and the next general Council.*—Thomas Cranmer."

IV. The fourth paper, &c. (the prefix exactly the same as in the third) [2]:

[1] This notice is in Latin, in "All the Submyssions," &c. &c.; viz. *Tertium Scriptum Cranmeri, suâ ipsius manu exaratum, et per eum in Buccardo exhibitum Londin. Episcopo.*

[2] *Quartum Scriptum*, &c. as in the preceding.

"Be it known by these presents, that I, Thomas Cranmer, Doctor in Divinity, and late Archbishop of Canterbury, do firmly, stedfastly, and assuredly, believe in all the Articles and points of the Christian religion and Catholic faith, as the Catholic Church doth believe, and hath ever believed from the beginning. Moreover, as concerning the Sacraments of the Church, I believe unfeignedly in all points as the said Catholic Church doth and hath believed from the beginning of Christian religion. In witness whereof I have humbly subscribed my hand unto these presents, the 16th day of February, 1555-6."

It will be observed that, of these four papers, the two first are without either date, or notice of the place where they were written and exhibited. The third and fourth are each preceded by a notification that they were presented to Boner in Bocardo; but the fourth is the only one which has a date, and that date is the 16th February, two days subsequent to Cranmer's degradation. It must, therefore, be concluded, that all the four were executed within the space of those two days. No one of them could have been executed previously to the 14th; for it surpasses all belief that the man who encountered the session of that day with such undaunted bearing, could, at the same time, have been listening favourably to secret proposals of submission. Neither is it to be imagined that any of these papers can have been written or signed at any period after the 16th, for the 16th is the date affixed to the last of them. And yet, on the other hand, it is far from easy to account for such a rapid succession of discreditable papers, all of them affirmed to have been signed, and two of them to have been actually written, by the prisoner's own hand.

There is another very perplexing circumstance attending these documents, which has been already noticed in the text; namely, that the last of them is by far the least

explicit of the four. It contains not one syllable respecting the authority of the Pope, or the laws and ordinances of the Queen. It amounts to nothing more than a profession of the Christian faith, conformably to the belief of the *Catholic* Church, from the time of its foundation. It is, manifestly, a step backwards in the path of concession. It almost warrants the belief that Cranmer was, even then, beginning to shrink from the turpitude of the preceding submissions, (if those submissions were ever made by him,) and to exhibit some alarming symptoms of returning fortitude. And this suspicion is, in part, confirmed by the fact, that the artifices of seduction were, soon after, so unscrupulously employed to complete the overthrow of his firmness.

Fifth upon the list stands the only Recantation ascribed to Cranmer by Foxe, who has translated it as follows:

"I, Thomas Cranmer, late Archbishop of Canterbury, do renounce, abhor, and detest, all manner of heresies and errors of Luther and Zuinglius, and all other teachings *which are contrary to sound and true doctrines.* And I believe most constantly in my heart, and with my mouth I confess, one holy and Catholic Church visible, without the which there is no salvation, and thereof I acknowledge the Bishop of Rome to be supreme head in earth, whom I acknowledge to be the highest Bishop and Pope, and Christ's vicar, unto whom all Christian people ought to be subject. And as concerning the Sacraments, I believe and worship in the Sacrament of the Altar the very body and blood of Christ, being contained most truly under the forms of bread and wine, the bread through the mighty power of God being turned into the body of our Saviour Jesus Christ, and the wine into his blood. And in the other six Sacraments also, like as in this, I believe and hold as the Universal Church holdeth, and the Church of Rome judgeth and determineth. Furthermore, I be-

lieve that there is a place of purgatory, where souls departed are punished for a time, for whom the Church doth godlily and wholesomely pray, like as it doth honour saints and maketh prayers to them. Finally, in all things I profess, that I do not otherwise believe than the Catholic Church, and the Church of Rome, holdeth and teacheth. I am sorry that I ever held or thought otherwise. And I beseech Almighty God, that of His mercy He will vouchsafe to forgive me whatsoever I have offended against God or His Church; and also I desire and beseech all Christian people to pray for me. And all such as have been deceived either by my example or doctrine, I require them by the blood of Jesus Christ that they will return to the unity of the Church, that we may be all of one mind without schism or division. And to conclude, as I submit myself to the Catholic Church of Christ, and to the supreme head thereof, so I submit myself unto the most excellent Majesties of Philip and Mary, King and Queen of this realm of England, &c. and to all their laws and ordinances, being ready always as a faithful subject ever to obey them. And God is my witness, that I have not done this for favour or fear of any person, but willingly, and of my own mind, as well to the discharge of my own conscience as to the instruction of others.

"Per me THOMAM CRANMER.

"*Witnesses to this subscription* } "Frater JOHANNES DE VILLA GARCINA.
"HENRICUS SYDALL."

This fifth paper appears *without any date*, either as to place or time. But it can hardly be doubted that, if ever it was signed by Cranmer, it must have been subsequently to his removal to Christ Church Deanery; though at what period, during his residence there, or after his return to

prison, it is impossible to ascertain. That Cranmer actually signed this paper, is usually considered as undeniable, and cannot now be disproved. Nevertheless, there are certain suspicious circumstances belonging to it, which are not unworthy of historical notice.

1. It might have been expected, that a confession so important would have been witnessed by individuals eminent for their rank and station; and, more especially, by the Dean of Christ Church, at whose lodgings he was then residing, or had recently resided. Instead of this, we find it attested only by two persons, and those comparatively obscure;—the one a Spanish Friar; the other, a man of whom little is known, except that he *had been* a great professor of the Reformed Doctrines, and that he returned to them again in the time of Queen Elizabeth[1].

2. The four first alleged submissions were all in English; this,—the fifth,—by far more complete than any of them, was drawn up in Latin. It is not easy to explain this circumstance, otherwise than on the supposition, that his tempters consigned it to a learned tongue, with some unworthy purpose of concealment or disguise. It looks very much as if they apprehended that the people in general would receive with incredulity a paper, importing so entire and sudden a revolution in the Archbishop's sentiments; and would suspect his adversaries of playing foully, and ascribing to him more decided language than he had ever, in fact, consented to use.

3. The paper in question was printed immediately on its alleged execution, as the Archbishop's recantation; and it has already been mentioned, as a fact well deserving of observation, that it was *instantly suppressed by the Council.* The order for delivering up all the printed copies *to be burned,* is dated on the 13th March; and, on

[1] Strype, Cranm. b. iii. c. 21., and Ecc. Mem. vol. iii. p. 394.

the 16th, the printers were compelled to enter into a recognizance to obey this mandate [1]. An attempt has been made to account for this very suspicious proceeding by a surmise, that either it may have been incorrectly printed, (of which there is not the slightest evidence, and which, if it were proved, would hardly be sufficient to explain the extreme solicitude and displeasure of the Council); *or*, that "they waited for a more perfect recantation, which Cranmer said that God wonld *inspire* him to make." In support of this latter supposition, nothing whatever has been produced but a vague expression of the French Ambassador, Noailles [2]: and, besides, it would be scarcely possible for *inspiration* itself to suggest a *more perfect recantation* than the one now in question. It is a much more obvious explanation of this measure, that the Government was anxious to recall a premature act, and to delay the publication of this, and the other submissions of the Archbishop, until after his death; an event which would effectually relieve them from all apprehensions of his disavowing any portion of the language which had been attributed to him by themselves.

4. Lastly, if this paper was actually adopted and signed by Cranmer, as it now stands, it is difficult to imagine what could be the object of exacting from him any further submission, unless it were for the purpose of heaping mortification upon him. We find, however, among the papers ascribed to him a sixth recantation, *also in Latin*, filled with expressions of abject self-abasement. The following is a translation of it:—

[1] Burnet, vol. iii. Anno 1556.—Todd's Hist. and Crit. Introd. p. cvii.

[2] Dr. Lingard's sole authority for this conjecture is the following passage: "Il envoya prier M. le Cardinal Polus de differer pour quelques jours son execution, esperant que Dieu l' *inspireroit* cependant." Noailles.

"I Thomas Cranmer, late Archbishop of Canterbury, confess, and grieve from my heart, that I have most grievously sinned against Heaven and the English realm; yea, against the Universal Church of Christ, which I have more cruelly persecuted than Paul did of old, who have been a blasphemer, a persecutor, and contumelious. And I wish that I, who have exceeded Saul in malice and wickedness, might with Paul make amends for the honour which I have detracted from Christ, and the benefit of which I have deprived the Church. But yet that thief in the Gospel comforts my mind. For then at last he repented from his heart, then it irked him of his theft, when he might steal no more. And I who, abusing my office, and authority, purloined Christ of his honour, and the realm of faith and religion, now by the great mercy of God returned to myself, acknowledge myself the greatest of all sinners, and to every one as well as I can, to God first, then to the Church and its supreme Head, and to the King and Queen, and lastly to the realm of England, to render worthy satisfaction. But as that happy thief, when he was not able to pay the money and wealth which he had taken away, when neither his feet nor his hands fastened to the cross could do their office; by heart only and tongue, which were not bound, he testified what the rest of his members would do, if they enjoyed the same liberty that his tongue did. By that he confessed Christ to be innocent; by that he reproved the impudence of his fellow; by that he detested his former life, and obtained the pardon of his sins, and as it were by a kind of key opened the gates of paradise. By the example of this man I do conceive no small hopes of Christ's mercy; that he will pardon my sins. I want hands and feet, by which I might build up again that which I have destroyed; for the lips of my mouth are only left me. But he will receive the calves of our lips, who is merciful beyond all belief. By this hope conceived, therefore I choose to

offer this calf, to sacrifice this very small part of my body and life.

"I confess, in the first place, my unthankfulness against the great God. I acknowledge myself unworthy of all favour and pity, but most worthy not only of human and temporal, but divine and eternal punishment; that I exceedingly offended against King Henry VIII. and especially against Queen Catharine his wife, when I was the cause and author of the divorce. Which fault indeed was the seminary of all the evils and calamities of this realm. Hence so many slaughters of good men; hence the schism of the whole kingdom; hence heresies; hence the destruction of so many souls and bodies sprang, that I can scarce comprehend with reason. But when these are so great beginnings of grief, I acknowledge I opened a great window to all heresies, whereof myself acted the chief doctor and leader; but first of all, which most vehemently torments my mind, that I affected the holy Sacrament of the Eucharist with so many blasphemies and reproaches, denying Christ's body and blood to be truly and really contained under the species of bread and wine. By setting forth also books, I did impugn the truth with all my might. In this respect indeed not only worse than Saul and the thief, but the most wicked of all which the earth ever bore. *Lord, I have sinned against Heaven, and before Thee.* Against Heaven, as I am the cause it hath been deprived of so many saints, denying most impudently that heavenly benefit exhibited to us. And I have sinned against the earth, which so long hath miserably wanted this sacrament. Against men, whom I have called from this supersubstantial morsel; the slayer of so many men as have perished for want of food. I have defrauded the souls of the dead of this daily and most celebrious sacrifice.

"And from all these things it is manifest, how greatly after Christ I have been injurious to his vicar, whom I

have deprived of his power by books set forth. Wherefore I do most earnestly and ardently beseech the Pope, that he, for the mercy of Christ, forgive me the things I have committed against him and the apostolical See. And I humbly beseech the most serene Sovereigns of England, Spain, &c. Philip and Mary, that by their royal mercy they would pardon me. I ask and beseech the whole realm, yea, the Universal Church, that they take pity of this wretched being, to whom, besides a tongue, nothing is left, whereby to make amends for the injuries and damages I have brought in. But especially, because against Thee only I have sinned, I beseech Thee, most merciful Father, who desirest and commandest all to come to Thee, however wicked, vouchsafe to look upon me nearly, and under Thy hand, as Thou lookedst upon Magdalen and Peter; or certainly as Thou, looking upon the thief on the cross, didst vouchsafe by the promise of Thy grace and glory to comfort a fearful and trembling mind; so, by Thy wonted and natural pity, turn the eyes of Thy mercy to me, and vouchsafe me worthy to have that Word of Thine spoken to me, *I am thy salvation;* and in the day of death, *To-day shalt thou be with me in paradise.*

"Per me THOMAS CRANMER."

"*Written this year of our Lord,* 1555-6,
the 18*th day of March.*"

This was, in fact, the last of Cranmer's Recantations, even on the supposition that the whole of the above six papers have been *truly* ascribed to him. We have, nevertheless, been told by Dr. Lingard, of "a seventh instrument of abjuration." There does, indeed, appear, seventh on the printed list of his "Submissions and Recantations," a paper with this title,—"The prayer and saying of Thomas Cranmer a little before his death, and written with his own hand." The contents of this paper are, *first,* an address to the people present, soliciting their

prayers; *secondly*, a prayer for himself, concluding with the Lord's Prayer; *thirdly*, a general exhortation to godliness and charity; *fourthly*, a brief memorandum, in the following words,—" Here to declare the Queen's just title to the crown?" and *fifthly*, a renunciation of the books he had published, and the doctrines he had maintained, against the Sacrament of the Altar, in the reign of Edward VI. Now with regard to these various articles, it must be observed, that of the five particulars above enumerated, the two last were never spoken by the Archbishop. It has been seen that, when he addressed the assembled audience just before his death, he omitted all notice of the Queen's title; and that, instead of finally renouncing his books and doctrines, he declared his sorrow and repentance for the dissimulation into which he had been tempted, by the hope of saving his life.

The following are the words of what has been called his " seventh instrument of abjuration:"—

" And now I come to the great thing that so much troubleth my conscience, more than any thing that ever I did; that is, setting abroad untrue books and writings, contrary to the truth of God's word; which now I renounce and condemn them utterly, as erroneous, and for none of mine. But you must know also what books they were, that you may beware of them, or else my conscience is not discharged. For they be the books which I wrote against the Sacrament of the Altar, since the death of King Henry VIII. But whatsoever I wrote then, now is the time and place to say truth. Wherefore, renouncing all those books, and whatsoever in them is contained, I say and believe, that our Saviour Christ Jesus is really and substantially contained in the blessed Sacrament of the Altar, under the forms of bread and wine."

Here let it be, once for all, carefully noted, that with these words this publication closes. It professes to be an

Account of *all* the Submissions and Recantations of Cranmer; it was sent forth, *after his death*, with the sanction of Boner's name; and yet it contains not one syllable to intimate, that the most important part of this last *saying* of Cranmer's was, in fact, never *said*. Any one who should peruse it, without any previous knowledge of the Archbishop's history, would inevitably conclude, that he died in the profession of the Romish faith; whereas it is well known, that although these words were prepared for him to speak, the words actually delivered by him, immediately before his execution, amounted to an "*abjuration*" of nothing but his recent weakness. It may, without any glaring breach of charity, be suspected, that persons who, in one most important instance, could send into the world a statement calculated to produce so false an impression, would not very scrupulously hesitate to publish an aggravated account of the Archbishop's other imputed submissions, when once he was silenced by death. And this consideration might alone be sufficient to justify us in pausing, before we give implicit credit to this official copy of "All the Submissions and Recantations of Thomas Cranmer."

Before we dismiss the subject, it will be necessary to offer one or two remarks on the narrative of the Roman Catholic spectator. One particular in it, well worthy of notice, is the avowal of Cole, that besides the causes alleged by him for the sacrifice of the Archbishop, there were "others which moved the Queen and Council, but which were not meet and convenient for every one to understand them." What these hidden motives of expediency might be, it would be vain to conjecture; but yet it is difficult to get rid of a suspicion, that they were of the same complexion with those which may have dictated the suppression of his recantations, till after he was destroyed. It would seem from these expressions of

the preacher, that there must have been something in the history of his "submissions," which was not altogether fit for the public ear. And if so, it was undoubtedly prudent to avoid all allusion to it, lest it should provoke the sufferer to certain incommodious disclosures, relative to the *precise extent* to which he had yielded to the artifices of his tempters.

Another remarkable circumstance is, the "assured hope conceived by the Protestants, of his conversion and repentance;" a hope which they scarcely could have entertained, had the Government thought it safe or fit to publish and to circulate, *before his death*, the sweeping recantation which now stands the fifth in Boner's printed statement. And yet, when we recollect how desirable it would have been for the Romish party to extinguish utterly all such expectations, we are at a loss to account for their hasty and anxious suppression of that paper, otherwise than by one conjecture,—namely, that the publication of it *during Cranmer's life* might expose the matter to very inconvenient question, perhaps to positive contradiction, from the Archbishop himself.

It has been confidently affirmed[1], that what was spoken in St. Mary's Church by Cranmer, as preliminary to the disavowal of his six retractations, was from the paper given to him in prison by Friar Garcina. That this statement is inaccurate, at least as to his prayer, might be reasonably inferred from the words with which he himself introduced it: "And now will I pray for myself, as *I could best devise for my own comfort*; and will say the prayer, word for word, as I have here written it" Besides, it must be difficult to imagine the condition either of the understanding or the heart, which could ascribe to any but the supplicant himself, these outpourings of a broken and contrite spirit. After all, however, the matter is of

[1] By Dr. Lingard, vol. vii.

no great importance. If the friar did actually supply him either with prayer, or exhortation, which he judged to be unexceptionable, there was no good reason why he should not adopt it, and produce it as his own.

Lastly, he is represented as "renouncing and refusing all such bills as he had *written or signed* with his own hand *since his degradation.*" These words place it almost beyond dispute, that previously to his degradation he retained his integrity untouched; and they further leave it doubtful, whether he had set his hand to all the first six papers which appear among his "*submissions.*" He speaks of bills which he had written *or* signed; and these words may possibly imply that some of them were only transcribed and accepted by him for consideration, with a view to protract the period of his fate, and if possible to avert it. They by no means amount to an admission that he added his name to every paper which is printed with his signature, in this posthumous series of his recantations.

These observations, though they can throw no doubt whatever over the fact of Cranmer's dissimulation, are at least sufficient for the purpose of showing, that a certain shade of mystery still hangs over these transactions, and that the world has never yet been in possession of a perfectly distinct and satisfactory account of the fall of Archbishop Cranmer. That his resolution failed him for a time, is a matter beyond all controversy. But, to this hour, it is far from being absolutely certain, that he passed through all the gradations of infamy described in the representations circulated by his adversaries.

THE END.

Gilbert & Rivington, Printers, St. John's Square, London.